General Theological Seminary Library
Ninth Ave. and 20th St., New York.

Besides the main topic this book also treats of

Subject No.	*On page*	*Subject No.*	*On page*

W. Walton
Jan^{y} 1844.

LETTERS

TO

N. WISEMAN, D. D.

ON THE

ERRORS OF ROMANISM,

IN RESPECT TO THE

WORSHIP OF SAINTS, SATISFACTIONS, PURGATORY, INDULGENCES, AND THE WORSHIP OF IMAGES AND RELICS.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M. A.

OF WORCESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

PROT. EPISC. CH.

BALTIMORE:

JOSEPH ROBINSON,

110 BALTIMORE STREET.

1843.

5376

BX
1765
.P3

PREFACE.

THE publication of the series of Letters now brought to a conclusion (at least for the present), was undertaken with a view to exhibit some of the most important features of Romanism in their genuine form. This task has become necessary in consequence of the systen of Reserve so generally practised by Romish controversialists, in reference to the more obnoxious parts of their system.

The system referred to, studiously distinguishes the doctrines and practices prevalent in the Roman Communion into two classes; the former consisting of matters of faith, or doctrines defined by the Church; the latter consisting of matters of opinion, or doctrines not so defined. The use made of this distinction in all writings and discourses intended for those who are opposed to Romanism, is to avoid all responsibility for, and all discussion on doctrines of the latter class, by representing them as mere non-essentials, which any member of the Roman Communion may dispute or reject at pleasure; while the attention of opponents is drawn entirely to the former class of doctrines, which being commonly proposed in general terms and with great caution, are far less assailable.

The benefits derived from this system are various. In the first place it induces some of those who are opposed to Romanism, to direct their attention almost entirely to the formal definitions of the Council of Trent, and to condemn some points which might be more discreetly left untouched. The effect of this to create division amongst opponents, and to place some of them in untenable positions. Secondly, all discussion is avoided on weak and vulnerable points, and there is no danger lest the

popular mind should be disturbed by doubts on the propriety of its most favourite notions and practices. Thirdly, it smooths away any opposition which might arise from Romanists themselves if these doctrines were pronounced essential; and facilitates their dissemination throughout the community. So that, in fine, the most highly objectionable tenets may be universally received amongst Romanists, and yet it may be positively denied that the Roman Catholic Church teaches those tenets. It has been a chief object in these Letters to detect and expose this system, which must be considered as more ingenious than honest.

The Author is desirous to record his most settled conviction, that evils are prevalent in the Roman Communion, of a far more dangerous character, than can be found elsewhere. In the present series of Tracts, only a small portion of those evils has been detailed; but enough has been said to shew, that several doctrines of a dangerous and heretical character, and various practices which are most decidedly Idolatrous, are openly, and without censure, disseminated, sanctioned, and authorized amongst Romanists.

Setting aside those sects which are bound by their profession to reject articles of the Christian faith, there are perhaps few religious communities which would not, on the whole, contrast favourably with Romanism. A comparison, not on insulated points, nor with any partial view, would suffice to shew, that any evils which may have arisen in connexion with the Reformation, were more than counterbalanced by the evils of the opposite system; and a more accurate knowledge of that system would enable us to do more justice to the principles of the Reformers, and to feel more gratitude for the results of their labours.

CONTENTS.

LETTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

Dr. Wiseman's episcopal rank denied.—Mr. Newman's language on Romanism explained.—Tactics of Romish controversialists.—The decrees of Trent not the only authoritative teaching in the Church of Rome.—Idolatrous addresses to the Virgin by the present Pope.—Similar prayers approved by other Popes.—Prayer of Cardinal Bona.—Romanists responsible for these prayers.—Idolatry of Ligorio.—Of Girolamo.—Idolatrous addresses to Saints.—Indulgences and Purgatory are made to take the place of Heaven and Hell.—Purgatory a place of torture according to Romanists.—Images.—Miscellaneous remarks on Dr. Wiseman's Pamphlet.

LETTER II.

ON THE FOUNDATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF SATISFACTION, INDULGENCES, &c.

Introduction.—Doctrine of temporal penalties due to remitted sin.—A large mass of error depends on this doctrine.—Its proofs from Reason examined.—Its scriptural proofs examined.—Specific objections to the doctrine.

LETTER III.

ON SATISFACTIONS OR PENANCES.

Romish doctrine of Satisfaction stated.—Requires perpetual penances.—Suppose the pardoned sinner still subject to God's wrath.—Destroys all peace of mind.—Makes Christians miserable, contrary to the Gospel.—Burdens of this doctrine, and miseries endured by devotees.—It leaves Christians without peace or hope.

LETTER IV.

ON THE SAME SUBJECT.

Romish arguments in support of Satisfactions from Scripture.—From the Fathers.—Orthodox doctrine on this subject.—Proved from Scripture.—Romish doctrine refuted by the Fathers.—By the Council of Trent.—By Romish practice.—By Romish theologians.—Conclusions from the whole discussion.

LETTER V.

ON THE WORSHIP OF SAINTS AND ANGELS.

Introductory remarks on Dr. Wiseman's reply.—Romanism convicted of Idolatry by his admissions.—His citations from spurious writings of the Fathers.—His defence of idolatrous addresses to the Virgin refuted.—His defence of idolatrous addresses to the Saints refuted.—Testimony of Catholic Antiquity against such addresses.—Additional proofs of Romish Idolatry and Superstition.

LETTER VI.

ON PURGATORY.

Introduction.—Doctrine of Purgatory stated and refuted.—Romish arguments refuted.—Orthodox doctrine opposed to Purgatory, confirmed by Scripture and Catholic Antiquity.—Punishment not due to remitted sins.

LETTER. VII.

ON INDULGENCES.

Connexion of Indulgences with privileged Altars and Churches, confraternities, associations, particular devotions, good works, &c.—Practical importance of Indulgences in the Romish system.—Doctrine of Indulgences refuted.—Ancient doctrine of Indulgences.—Origin of Romish doctrine.—Objections to it.

LETTER VIII.

ON THE WORSHIP OF IMAGES AND RELICS.

Uneasiness of Romanists under the Charge of Idolatry.—Reasons for this.—Idolatry what.—Idolatry taught by eminent Romish divines.—Romish subterfuges.—Dangers of the system.—Conclusion.

A LETTER

TO

N. WISEMAN, D. D.

(CALLING HIMSELF BISHOP OF MELIPOTAMUS,)

CONTAINING REMARKS ON HIS

LETTER TO MR. NEWMAN.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M. A.
OF WORCESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

A LETTER &c.

Sir,

Having ascertained from Mr. Newman that it is not his intention to make any reply to your Letter, (a resolution which considering his recent labours, cannot excite surprise,) I take the liberty of offering to your notice certain remarks which the perusal of your Letter has irresistibly suggested, and I sincerely hope, that the "plainness of speech" which in a discussion of such importance, it is necessary to employ, will not be regarded by yourself or by others as indicating any want of respect for your abilities and attainments, or any deficiency in charity and good feeling.

You will excuse me therefore, if I seem to question your right to the title of "bishop" which you assume, and which your adherents are willing to recognise. You, at least, cannot deny, that episcopal consecrations, performed *ostensibly* for Churches without clergy or people, but *really* for the purpose of introducing or perpetuating *schism*, are illegitimate, and confer no canonical mission or jurisdiction.[a] You are aware, that such ordinations are, according to the Canons, virtually null and void; and that they do not constitute those who receive them *real* bishops—successors of the Apostles. If therefore, as is reported, you have received the form of episcopal consecration at Rome, this does not prove you to be a bishop, or excuse you for exercising episcopal and sacerdotal functions without the license, and in opposition to the authority, of your legitimate Diocesan, the Bishop of Worcester: an offence which subjects you to deposition and excommunication by the Canons received by the whole Catholic Church.

You have availed yourself with characteristic sagacity of the existing controversy, to invite public attention to those views of Romish doctrines and practices, which the leaders of your party are anxious to impress on us. I rejoice for the sake of Truth that you have stepped forward so promptly in vindication of those views. It will afford an opportunity for testing their accuracy. Circumstanced as Romanism is in this country, it is perfectly natural that its advocates should endeavour to disem-

[a] Dublin Review, vol. v. p. 288, &c.

barrass themselves, as far as possible, of various doctrines and practices which have given serious offence. The interests of your communion are so obviously promoted by such a policy, that language and sentiments are *tolerated* under your circumstances, which in a purely Romish country would be visited with severe reprobation—perhaps, might put you in the prisons of the Inquisition. The *end* for which you labour sanctifies, in the eyes of your superiors, means which they would otherwise view with jealousy and displeasure. Romanists in England have long been deeply sensible of the obstacles which are presented to their system of proselytism by the existence of general *prejudices* (as they regard them) against the superstitions of their Church. They have felt with you, that "it is "exceedingly difficult to think differently from what every "body about us has always been thinking and saying. It is "almost impossible to stay the mind, when hurried on by the "press of those behind and on either side of us." (p. 19.) And as the general impression has been and continues to be, that superstitious and idolatrous doctrines or practices are more or less authoritatively sanctioned by the Church of Rome, you avail yourself of the opportunity afforded by Mr. Newman's statement to that effect, to clear your Communion as far as you can from imputations so injurious to its interests, and so distressing to your own feelings as an active agent in the system of proselytism.

It will be my endeavour in the following pages to shew, that public opinion is not so grossly mistaken in these matters as you would fain have us imagine, and that, while it would be undoubtedly most unjust to attribute superstitions and idolatrous notions or practices to those individuals of your Communion who disclaim them *for themselves*, the stain adheres most deeply to the community at large, and that the Roman is, emphatically, a *corrupt* Church.

You have, as you imagine, detected at the commencement of Mr. Newman's Letter to Dr. Jelf, an untenable position, and you direct against this assumed position a vast deal of argument more or less plausible; but you have so *obviously* mistaken and misrepresented his views, that I can only account for the mistakes you have committed, by the haste with which you have rushed into this controversy.

Mr. Newman states his persuasion, that the Thirty-Nine Articles "do contain a condemnation of the authoritative teach-"ing of the Church of Rome" on the subjects of Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration of Images and Relics, the Invocation of Saints, and the Mass. He asserts indeed, and

rightly asserts, (speaking *generally*,) that whereas those Articles "were written *before* the Decrees of Trent, they were not "directed against those *Decrees*."[b] But still, he maintains that the Church of Rome does, even now, in some sense authoritatively teach the errors and superstitions against which the Articles are directed, and which were held by Romanists when those Articles were compiled. His next words are, "The Church of Rome taught authoritatively before those "Decrees (of Trent) as well as since. Those *expressed* her "authoritative teaching, and they will *continue* to express it, "while she so teaches. The simple question is, whether *taken "by themselves, in their mere letter*, they express it; whether, "in fact, other senses, *short of the sense conveyed in the "present authoritative teaching of the Roman Church*, will not "fulfil their letter, and may not even now, in point of fact, be "held in that Church." (p. 6.)

The meaning of this passage is obvious. It asserts as plainly as words can do, that the *wording* of the Decrees of Trent in some points may not convey doctrines which our Articles condemn; while the *interpretation* generally given by the Romanists—their practical comment—the comment furnished by Authority exterior to the Council of Trent, is objectionable. Mr. N. in the next page explains that he is speaking of the "*popular*" system" of Romanism, and soon afterwards he mentions, "the *comment* which the Church of Rome has put on them "(the Decrees of Trent) in preaching and practice." (p. 9.)

Having perused all these passages, you thus address Mr. N. "Your intention seems to be, as far as I can gather it from "these and other passages in the Letter, to establish a *distinction* between the doctrines defined or decreed in the "General Council of Trent, and the authoritative teaching of "the Roman Church." Certainly: so far you have caught his meaning. He undoubtedly does draw a distinction between the Decrees of Trent, and the authorized teaching of the Church of Rome on these points. That is, he is of opinion, that the words of the Decrees of Trent "*fall short of the sense* "conveyed in *the present authoritative teaching* of the Roman "Church." (p. 6.) The Decrees are encumbered by a practical comment which goes far beyond them.

You now triumph in the persuasion that you have placed your opponent in an absurd position, and you ironically remark, "The existence of any such authoritative teaching *at variance* with the doctrines of the Tridentine Synod, is to me

[b] Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 6.

"a novel idea, and I think it will prove so to all Catholics." (p. 5.)

Permit me for a moment to arrest you in this hasty jump to a conclusion. You have correctly stated, that Mr. Newman maintains a *distinction* between the Decrees of Trent on these subjects, and the present authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome; but surely *distinction* does not necessarily imply *variance* or opposition. You have studied so long in the Roman schools, that this cannot have escaped your observation. Why then do you so readily assume that Mr. N. would set the present authoritative teaching of the Roman Church "*at variance*" with the Decrees of Trent?

You have commenced by mistaking the plain meaning of your Author, and in this mistake you steadily persist to the end of your Pamphlet. Excuse me, Sir, if, on further consideration, it appears to me that this mistake is not quite *unintentional*. One might hesitate indeed before one presumed to think, that so practised a controversialist as yourself had permitted any thing to escape from his pen inadvertently. Romish controversialists have before now found it convenient to close their own eyes, and to endeavour to close those of the public, against distinctions in which the turning points of controversy are involved. Nothing would be less in accordance with the system which has been adopted by the English Romanists in their controversies with us, than the recognition of such a distinction as that which you have assailed. The *language of the Council of Trent* has been your invariable refuge, whenever we have pressed you hard with the errors and superstitions prevalent in your Church. To this alone you would gladly direct our attention, as presenting the only exposition of doctrine authorized by all the Churches in communion with Rome. Whatever else may be held or practised amongst you, is, you would assure us, only a matter of *private* opinion or practice—*quite unauthorized*. And your Church is therefore to be held responsible for nothing but the guarded and comparatively moderate statements of the Council of Trent. You would persuade us, that because idolatry and superstition are not pronounced *necessary to salvation* by your Church—because you are not obliged to practise them under pain of Anathema—because they do not enter into the very language of the decrees *de fide*—your Church is quite free from the offence of allowing and authorizing them. You seem to argue, that because you *may* be Romanists without superseding the worship of God by that of the Virgin Mary, the Saints, Images, and Relics, you are therefore *actually* free, generally speaking, from the guilt

of so doing. Your argument goes to prove, that a man who deliberately takes the life of another, is not a murderer, provided that his act is purely voluntary, and is not done in obedience to the law of God or of the Church. This is a very convenient system of argument indeed. It enables you to avoid any discussion on the weak points of your Church, and to raise an outcry against the prejudice and bigotry of those who would venture to impute superstitions or errors to the Church of Rome generally. It will be my endeavour to shew, that there is some authoritative teaching in the Church of Rome besides that of the Council of Trent, and you will yourself afford testimony to the correctness of this position.

But I return to your pamphlet. You ask Mr. N. what his reply would be, if you should assert that an interpretation at variance with that which he believes "*to be the only one reconcile-* "*able with catholic truth*" is generally prevalent in the Church of England, and should thence argue, that the Church of England is "*not* to be judged by the Articles, but by such authorita- "tive teaching, and that therefore its doctrines, and consequently "itself, are not catholic." (p. 5.) The reply is obvious and easy. You have no reason to assume that Mr. N. believes his interpretation to be "the only one reconcileable with catholic "truth." He merely advances what appears to him *a* catholic interpretation. I am of opinion that the language of the Articles, and the circumstances under which they were written, point to an interpretation somewhat different from that advanced by Mr. N. and yet I have not the least doubt that he would readily admit the orthodoxy of that interpretation, though different from his own. Your premises therefore break down; and your conclusion finishes in smoke. Supposing however, that, for the sake of argument, he were to admit, that the Articles are unsoundly interpreted by many persons, still that would not render the Church uncatholic, while such interpretations are *openly opposed* by many other persons of learning and authority, and while they are not recommended and urged by the authorities of the Church. When you can shew, that the idolatrous and superstitious doctrines and practices *authorized* in your Church are openly opposed and condemned by any influential portion of its members, we shall be rejoiced to relieve your Communion from imputations which must, until then, adhere to it.

"It is a serious thing," you continue, "to charge us with "setting up the Blessed Virgin in place of the Holy Trinity, "and Purgatory instead of Heaven and Hell. We naturally "ask, what shall be considered sufficient *evidence* of there

"being an *authoritative teaching* that supersedes the solemn "and synodal Decrees of our Church, and makes us *responsible* "*in solidum* for its lessons?" (p. 6.) To this question you have yourself in part furnished the reply in the next page, where you say, "To the teaching of the Roman schools, "the Catechism of the Council of Trent, and the sentiments "of the best writers, *I have no objections to make.* But that "you should give as evidence of authoritative teaching *popular* "notions and practices is certainly surprising." You therefore admit that there *is* some *authoritative teaching* in the Church of Rome, besides that of the Decrees of Trent, and of course you cannot hesitate to add to the sources of such authoritative teaching, the decrees of Roman Pontiffs, and the actions of canonized Saints, which are held up *at this day* for the imitation and edification of the whole Roman Church. I am perfectly satisfied with the concessions you have made, and I believe there will be little difficulty in establishing on these grounds the substantial correctness of the positions which Mr. N. has advanced. Let us consider those positions for a moment.

Of "the present authoritative teaching of the Church of "Rome," he says, "Instead of setting before the soul the Holy "Trinity, and Heaven and Hell, it does seem to me, as *a popular system*, to preach the blessed Virgin, and the Saints, and "Purgatory,"—And again, "In the Roman schools we find "St. Mary and the Saints the prominent objects of regard and "dispensers of mercy, Purgatory or Indulgences the means of "obtaining it." (p. 7.)

Without doubt, "it is a serious thing" to make this charge, and "it is *a serious thing*" for you to hear it made. You do not relish such plain speaking. I must however entreat you to bear with me, while I proceed to establish its substantial accuracy—while I demonstrate, that the Blessed Virgin, the Saints, Indulgences, or Purgatory, are commonly and authoritatively set before the souls of your people instead of the Trinity, Heaven and Hell, and viewed as prominent objects of regard, dispensers of mercy, or means of obtaining it. After this I shall proceed to consider the remainder of your Letter.

---

1. *The Blessed Virgin is authoritatively set before your souls instead of the Trinity.*

It is not meant that the Roman Church *disbelieves* the Trinity, or *never worships* the Trinity, but that the Virgin receives honours which are due only to the Trinity—honours which interfere with the sole prerogatives of the Deity. The

first proof of this shall be derived from an authoritative document which all members of your Communion are bound to reverence. I mean, the Encyclical Letter of Pope Gregory XVI. addressed in 1832 to all Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops, in which the following passage occurs.

"We hasten unto you, Venerable brethren, and as a sign of "our good will towards you, we address this letter to you, on "this most joyful day, when we solemnize the festival of the "triumphant Assumption of the Holy Virgin into Heaven, that "she whom we have acknowledged *as our patroness and de-*"*liverer* amongst the greatest calamities, may *propitiously* "*assist us while we write, and by her celestial inspiration may* "*guide us to such councils as may be most salutary to the* "*Christian Church.*"

I need scarcely remark, that the passages printed in Italics distinctly invest the Virgin with the attributes of Deity. The holy Psalmist declares, that GOD is his "fortress and de-"liverer," (Ps. cxliv. 2.)—his "help and deliverer." (Ps. xl. 17.) The Pope regards the Virgin Mary as *his* "patron and "deliverer." The Prophet Isaiah teaches us, that "counsel" is one of the seven gifts of the HOLY SPIRIT, (Is. xl. 2.) The Roman Church herself prays in the sacrament of Confirmation, "Emitte in eos (confirmandos) septiformem Spiritum tuum "Paraclitum de cœlis, Spiritum sapientiæ et intellectus, Spiri-"tum *consilii* et fortitudinis," &c. (Pontifical. Rom. De Confirm.) I turn to the first treatise on the Trinity by one of your Professors of Theology that comes to my hand, and I there find that the *Divinity* of the Son and of the Holy Ghost is proved amongst other things by the fact, that the power of giving grace, of giving spiritual gifts, is ascribed to them in holy Scripture. (See Tournely de Trinitate, p. 384, 499.) And yet, notwithstanding all this, the Pope ascribes confidently to the *Virgin Mary* the very powers which Scripture and tradition give to the Holy Ghost.

And now, Sir, perilous and idolatrous as such sentiments are, have they ever once been publicly objected to by a single member of your Communion? Has any one of you ever *dared* to protest against this ascription of the attributes of Deity to a creature? Will you yourself venture to utter a word in opposition to it? I am afraid this would be rather too much to expect from any "Vicar Apostolic." And why is it that the

"Ut quam patronam ac sospitam inter maximas quasque calamitates persensimus, ipsa et scribentibus ad vos nobis adstet propitia, mentemque nostram cœlesti afflatu suo in ea inducat consilia, quæ Christiano gregi futura sint quàm maximè salutaria.

whole body of your Communion have remained silent, and refrained from uttering a word in censure of language so plainly savouring of heresy and idolatry? Why is it, that even those amongst you who may disapprove of such statements, have remained mute and confounded? Because they emanate from *Authority*—an Authority to which you are obliged to submit. You have asked for some proof that the Virgin Mary is *authoritatively* put forward in your Church instead of the Trinity; and I believe you have received a sufficient answer.

I pass over another passage of the same revolting character at the conclusion of the Encyclical Letter, and proceed to other proofs which will further establish the character of the authoritative teaching in your Church. You will not deny the authority of the Litany of the Blessed Virgin, printed at the end of the Roman Catechism compiled by the Cardinal Bellarmine, and to the repetition of which, Indulgences were attached by Sixtus V, Benedict XIII, and Pius VII. At the conclusion of this is the following prayer.

"We fly to *thy protection*, Holy Mother of God, *despise not our prayers* in our necessities, but *deliver us* at all times *from all evils*, glorious and blessed Virgin."[d] The holy Psalmist placed his trust in God. "THE LORD will be a refuge for the oppressed, a refuge in times of trouble." (Ps. ix. 9.) He consoled the afflicted of Israel by the hope that THE LORD "will regard the prayer of the destitute, and not despise their prayer. (Ps. cii. 17.) Our Lord himself taught us to pray to our heavenly Father to "deliver us from all evil." And yet, in spite of all this, the Popes grant indulgences for the repetition of prayers which express the very same sort of confidence in the Virgin as the Scriptures teach us to feel towards God.

I will here mention another prayer to the Virgin, to the repetition of which Pius VI. in 1786 granted Indulgences. It is as follows: "Condescend to permit me to praise thee, sacred "Virgin. *Grant me strength against thine enemies.* Blessed "be God in his Saints."[e] The "Stabat Mater," which has Indulgences annexed to its repetition by Innocent XI, is full of similar petitions.[f] But I will not dwell further on this branch of the subject.

You wish for some proofs from your "best writers," or any of them, that the Virgin Mary is presented instead of the

[d] Sub tuum præsidum confugimus, sancta Dei Genetrix, nostras deprecationes ne despicias in necessitatibus nostris; sed a periculis cunctis libera nos semper, Virgo gloriosa et benedicta.

[e] Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, p. 244.

[f] Ib. p. 245.

Trinity, and that she is regarded as the dispenser of mercy. You will readily admit the eminent learning and piety of Cardinal Bona. Hear then the following prayer extracted from his writings.

"Oh most sweet Virgin Mary, Mother of God and our Lord "Jesus Christ, *refuge of sinners,* and *mother of Mercy,* I com-"mit myself this day and evermore to thy peculiar *protection* "with most humble devotion. Place me near unto thee, and "*protect me from all my enemies visible and invisible. Say* "*unto my soul,* I AM THY SALVATION. Direct me thy servant "in all my ways and actions. Console me in all my griefs and "afflictions. Defend and preserve me from all evils and dan-"gers. Turn thy face unto me when the end of my life shall "come; and may *thy consolation,* in that tremendous hour, "rejoice my spirit. *Thou canst do all that thou wilt in hea-"ven and earth, nor can any resist thy will,* for thou obtainest "from the Almighty whatever thou seekest. Hear therefore "and *receive my prayers,* and despise me not when I confide "in thy mercy. Behold *I fall down before thee,* most gracious "Virgin, *I fall down and worship* IN THEE *thy Son,* and I "implore thy suffrages to obtain that my sins may be blotted "out, to reconcile the heart of thy Son to my heart, that He may "possess me, and make me a man according unto his heart."[g]

If this prayer does not ascribe to the blessed Virgin the Divine attribute of "dispensing mercy," I know not what words can do so. She is addressed exactly in the terms which we should use in praying to the second or third Persons of the Holy Trinity. We see in it the same feeling of confidence in the protection of the Being addressed—the same degree of worship which is offered to Jesus Christ. "I fall down and worship IN THEE thy Son." *The Virgin Mary is worshipped with the honour due to God!* You will not, I venture to say, express any disapprobation of this prayer, any more than of the sentiments of Gregory XVI. or of the authorized and indulgenced prayers which I have cited above. You will be satisfied to say, that such things are not enforced upon your consciences by the Decrees of the Council of Trent. Then if they are not, your guilt is so much the greater in practising them. By your own confession, such idolatrous invocations are not

[g] "In hora illa tremenda consolatio tua lætificet spiritum meum. Omnia potes quæcumque vis in cœlo et in terra, nec est qui possit resistere voluntati tuæ . . . . . Ecce procido coram te, benignissima Virgo, procido et adora in te Filium tuum," &c. Jo. Bonæ Presbyt. Cardinalis, Horologium Asceticum, §. 2. Opuscula Spiritualia, t. i. p. 13.

compulsory on you. They are therefore *voluntary;* and you are wholly without excuse or justification. It is in vain to allege that they are not universally approved or received. What *proofs* can you afford of this assertion? When have you yourself protested against them? Who amongst you lifts up his voice against them? You content yourselves with *general disclaimers* of superstition and idolatry, but you will never venture to lay your finger on any specific case amongst the thousands which are authorized amongst you.

But I have not concluded this branch of the subject yet. I have to adduce a third branch of evidence, the authority of which you, at least, will scarcely deny. I allude to the "Lives of St. Alphonsus Liguori, St. Francis de Girolamo, &c. "whose canonization took place on Trinity Sunday, May 26, "1839." Of this publication you are the *reputed Editor*,[h] and if you are unwilling to avow your connexion with it, you cannot hesitate to admit the authority attached to the actions and sentiments of *Saints* recently canonized, after the strictest and minutest investigation of their lives and conduct by the highest tribunals in the Roman Church—actions and sentiments which had been brought under the special notice of those tribunals, and which are now published (probably by yourself) for the general edification and imitation of Roman Catholics. Let us then see what is thus authorized by your Church. I extract the following from the Life of St. Alphonsus Liguori.

"His loving patroness, our blessed Lady, rewarded his zeal "in the cause of charity and devotion by appearing to him in "the sight of an immense crowd of people collected in the "Church of Foggia to listen to a discourse upon his *favorite* "*subject*, the intercession and patronage of Mary. From her "countenance a ray of light, like that of the sun, was reflected "upon the face of *her devout servant*, which was seen by all "the people, who cried out '*a miracle! a miracle!*' and *re-*"*commended themselves* with *great fervour and many tears* to "*the Mother of God;* and many women of abandoned life "were seized with such intense sorrow, that they mounted "upon a platform in the church, and began to discipline them-"selves and cry aloud for mercy; and then leaving the church, "retired to the house of penitents in that city. Alphonsus, in

[h] At the end of the Catholic Directory and Annual Register for the year 1841, I find in the Catalogue of Books of "F. A. Little, Catholic Bookseller and Stationer," the following:—

WORKS BY THE REV. DR. WISEMAN.

. . . . .

The Lives of St. Alphonsus Liguori, &c.

"his judicial attestation, deposed, that during the Sermon, he, "together with the assembled audience, saw the countenance "of the blessed Virgin resembling that of a girl of fourteen or "fifteen years of age, who turned from side to side, as was "witnessed by every one present."[i]

"Whilst he was preaching on the patronage of the blessed "Virgin, and exciting his hearers *to recur with confidence to* "*her in all their wants*, he suddenly exclaimed, 'O, you are "too cold *in praying to our blessed Lady! I will pray to her* "*for you.*' He knelt down in the attitude of prayer, with his "eyes raised to heaven, and was seen by all present lifted more "than a foot from the ground, and *turned towards a statue of* "*the blessed Virgin* near the pulpit. The countenance of our "Lady (the statue!) darted forth beams of light, which shone "upon the face of the ecstatic Alphonsus. This spectacle "lasted about five or six minutes, during which the people "cried out, '*Mercy, mercy! a miracle, a miracle!*' and every "one burst into a flood of tears. But the Saint rising up, ex- "claimed in a loud voice, 'Be glad, *for the blessed Virgin has* "*granted your prayer.*'"[k]

Now, Sir, with every disposition to avoid uncharitable or general imputations of idolatry, and to allow the sincerity of those amongst you who disclaim it, I cannot refrain from expressing to you the horror and amazement which such a scene inspires. Here is a *Saint* of your Church—a Saint canonized only two years ago, and after the most rigid investigation of all his actions by the highest authorities amongst you.—This Saint excites his hearers to "recur with confidence to the Virgin in "all their wants," as if she were a Deity. He follows this up by kneeling down and "*praying*" to the Virgin.—Observe, not *seeking her intercession*, but *praying* to her. *A miracle* is wrought to sanction this impiety; and that nothing may be wanting to complete the abomination of the scene, this miracle is wrought, *while the Saint is in an attitude of adoration before the image of the Virgin*, and while that image itself becomes, as it were, *animated*, and testifies the presence of the Virgin within it! This is the teaching which you place before the members of your Church. This is the teaching which your Saints inculcate—your Cardinals and your Pope approve and authorize—and which you yourself print and publish for the edification of the faithful! But I pass on to another example of the same teaching.

[i] Lives of St. Alphonsus Liguori, &c. p. 12. Dolman, London, 1839.
[k] Ib. p. 27.

"He established confraternities amongst his flock, as a means "of inducing them to frequent the Sacraments, and to hear the "word of God, and maintained the spirit of their foundation by "frequently preaching to them; and one evening, whilst he "was preaching during a retreat to the confraternity of gentle- "men at Arienzo *upon the patronage of the blessed Virgin*, he "was on a sudden wrapt in ecstasy, and his countenance shone "with such splendour, that the whole Church was lighted up "with unusual brightness; and he exclaimed, 'See, the blessed "Virgin is come *to dispense graces amongst us; let us pray* "*to her, and we shall obtain whatever we ask.*'"[1]

When Moses descended from the mount with these words of God, "I am the Lord thy God. *Thou shalt have none other* "*Gods but me*," the skin of his face shone, and they were afraid to come nigh him. Liguori is invested with an equally miraculous splendour, while he declares that the Virgin is a Goddess— while he asserts that she "dispenses graces," or is invested with the attributes of the Deity, and while he admonishes the people to address her as an *all-powerful* Being! Which would you have us believe? Or is this fable intended to turn the Scripture itself into ridicule and contempt, and to afford Infidels the means of opposing Revelation to Revelation, and arguing the absurdity of the whole from its contradictions? I turn to the life of another of your recently canonized Saints, St. Francis di Girolamo, where, after some mention of his love of *Christ*, the following passage occurs.

"In like manner he was *tenderly devoted to our blessed* "*Lady*. For twenty-two years he preached a Sermon in her "praise and honour *every week*. To youth especially, it was "his custom to recommend this devotion *as the surest preser-* "*vative of innocence, and the best remedy against sin*; saying "that *one could hardly be saved* who felt no devotion towards "the Mother of God. Mary was *his counsellor* in doubt, *his* "*comfort* in toil, *his strength* in all his enterprises, *his refuge* "in danger and distress. He experienced an inexpressible "delight whenever he recited the Rosary of our blessed "Mother." Lives of Liguori, &c. p. 101.

I leave this passage to speak for itself. It requires no comment. If ever idolatrous reverence was felt for a created being, it certainly was in this case; and yet this is an example which the authorities of your Church hold up for general admiration! With such facts before the public, you have the confidence to ask for *evidence* that the Virgin and the Saints are set up

[1] Ib. p. 35.

instead of the Holy Trinity. Can you ask for better evidence than that which has been given? I have not quoted antiquated documents—I have not cited a thousand idolatrous passages from your books of popular devotion and other unauthorized sources—I have not referred to "local abuses" or "popular "superstitions," but to the highest and most undeniable *authorities* in your Church. They convict you of all that has been alleged against you, and you may writhe beneath that conviction, but you cannot escape from it, except by shewing what it *is impossible to shew*, that the errors and idolatries which I have pointed out, have been resisted and protested against in your community.

2. The saints are authoritatively placed before you instead of the Trinity. That is, they share the honours of the Deity —they receive honours which are only due to GOD.

In proof of this I again appeal to the Encyclical Letter of Gregory XVI, where, near the conclusion, he thus addresses all the Bishops of the Roman Obedience.

"We will also *earnestly beseech* with *humble prayers* from "the Prince of the Apostles, Peter, and from his co-Apostle "Paul, *that you may stand as a wall*, that no other foundation "be laid but that which has been laid. Relying on this de-"lightful hope, we trust that the author and finisher of our "faith, Jesus Christ, will at length console us in all our tribu-"lations. (Id et ab apostolorum principe Petro, et ab ejus co-"apostolo Paulo humili prece efflagitemus, ut stetis omnes pro "muro, ne fundamentum aliud ponatur præter id quod positum "est. Hâc jucundâ spe freti, confidimus auctorem consumma-"toremque fidei Jesum Christum consolaturum tandem esse "nos omnes in tribulationibus, &c.")

To avoid mistakes it may be necessary to observe, that the "foundation" here alluded to is not the Saviour, but the established doctrine and discipline of the Roman Church, the dangers of which deeply excite the Pontiff's grief and alarm. In this passage then St. Peter and St. Paul are distinctly invested with the attributes of Divine Providence. They are supposed to give grace and power to the Bishops—to confirm them in the faith. *No prayer whatever is addressed to any Person of the blessed Trinity.* No supplications are offered to our Lord, but it is *hoped* that in consequence of the prayers addressed to the Virgin Mary and the Apostles Peter and Paul, he will console his Church. St. Mary, Peter, and Paul, *guard* and *protect* the Church—our Lord *consoles* it! Such is the system taught *by authority.*

Do you wish for further evidence? It shall be immediately supplied.

Pius VII. by his decrees of the 28th April, 1807, granted 300 days of indulgence to all who should devoutly use the following invocations.[m]

"Jesus, *Joseph and Mary, I offer to you my heart and my soul.*

"Jesus, *Joseph and Mary, assist me in my last agony.*

"Jesus, *Joseph and Mary, may my soul expire in peace with you.*"

This, Sir, is a new Trinity, wholly unknown to Scripture or to Catholic Tradition.

Pius VI. by a Brief dated 2d October, 1795, granted an Indulgence of 100 days to the faithful who repeat the following prayer to their guardian Angel.

"Angel of God, who art my guardian, enlighten me who "am committed to thee with heavenly piety, guard, direct, and "govern me. Amen." Bouvier, p. 248.

Pius VII. by his Rescript of September 21st, 1802, granted a year's Indulgence, applicable to the dead, to every Catholic priest, who should recite the following prayer.

"O, holy Joseph, guardian and father of Virgins, to whose "faithful care Christ Jesus, who was Innocence itself, and "Mary, Virgin of Virgins, was committed, I beseech and pray "thee by both these dear pledges *Jesus and Mary, to preserve* "*me from all uncleanness*, and *make* me ever most chastely to "serve Jesus *and Mary*, with an undefiled mind, a pure heart, "and a chaste body. Amen. (Te per hoc utrumque charissi- "mum pignus Jesum et Mariam obsecro et obtestor, ut me ab "omni immunditiâ præservatum, mente incontaminatâ, puro "corde, et casto corpore Jesu et Mariæ semper facias castis- "simè famulari. Amen.") Bouvier, p. 265.

In this prayer Joseph is addressed as *a Deity*—a Being who has the power of bestowing divine grace, and of enabling Christians to serve God. The Son of God is made a sort of *Mediator* between Joseph and his worshippers; and, in fine, the service of Christians is supposed to be divided between Jesus and Mary! And yet this is a prayer sanctioned by the highest authority in your Church, and unscrupulously published in your most approved practical Treatises on Indulgences.

I shall only extract, in addition, the following prayer from one of your best and most approved Authors, Cardinal Bona.

"Holy Angels, seals of the Divine likeness, full of wisdom,

[m] Bouvier, Traite des Indulgences, p. 226.

" perfect in beauty, be present with me and defend me from the " assaults of evil spirits, from the frauds and snares of the " enemy. Inflame me with that fire which the Lord sent on " earth, and which he desired to burn vehemently. Ye seven " Spirits which stand before the Lord ever prepared to do his " bidding, succour a wanderer in this vale of tears. Cleanse " me from all filthiness, and infuse into my mind the splendour " of the saints, that all earthly matter being consumed, I may " burn wholly with divine love, and become one spirit with " God for ever. Thou St. Michael, most glorious Prince of the " celestial army, helper of the people of God, receiver of the " elect souls, who hast fought with the Dragon and conquered, " come to my assistance in this doubtful battle, which I, un- " armed and feeble as I am, must wage with a most powerful " foe . . . You, ye other saints of God, to whose patronage I " have intrusted myself, and whose feast is this day celebrated, " assist me a miserable sinner sitting in darkness and the sha- " dow of death. Dissolve the bonds of my captivity, &c." Bona, Oper. Spiritual. t. i. p. 13, 14, 15.

I believe it would be needless to adduce any more proofs that Saints and Angels receive in your Church honours which are only due to God.

3. I am now to shew, that your Church regards Purgatory or Indulgences as "means of obtaining mercy," and that they are preached "instead of Heaven and Hell." Do not suppose that I mean to assert, that Heaven and Hell are not believed or preached amongst you. I only contend, that Indulgences (which are connected with Purgatory) are made *to take the place*, which Scripture and Catholic tradition assign only to considerations connected with the eternal state; that they are presented to the consciences and the hopes of your people, to influence them to the performance of duties which ought only to be urged on the motives of the love and fear of God. This is what we complain of. We see good works urged amongst you on motives which obscure and interfere with the grand and simple motives which Revelation places before us. When *we* would excite our brethren to the performance of good works, we can but say to them, "Yield yourselves unto God, *as those* " *that are alive from the dead*, and your members as instru- " ments of righteousness unto God." (Rom. vi. 13.) We can but quote to them our Saviour's words, "If ye love me, keep " my commandments . . . . He that hath my commandments " and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth " me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and " will manifest myself unto him." (John xiv. 15—21.) And

again, "Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where "neither the rust and moth doth corrupt, and where thieves "do not break through nor steal. For where your treasure is, "there will your heart be also." (Matt. vi. 20, 21.) These are the only motives which Scripture and Tradition place before us. Our works are to be done simply in reliance on God's assistance, and with a view to shew forth our love and obedience to Him, without which we should forfeit eternal life. Not so with you. Every good work has in your eyes a very different sort of value. It is a satisfaction for sins, it is a means of obtaining so many days or years of Indulgence from the tortures of Purgatory.

Are your people to be excited to visit the sick, to give alms to the poor, to hear mass, to repent of their sins and confess to a priest, to receive the holy Eucharist, to pray for the extirpation of heresies, the propagation of the Catholic faith, and for the Church generally? You may promise them a *plenary Indulgence* on certain feast-days in the year.[n] Do you wish to excite the people to repeat devotional offices during their life, and to recommend their souls to God at the hour of death? You promise them Indulgences. (Ib. p. 185.) Is it your desire that they should instruct their children, relations, or servants, in the Christian doctrine? You offer them two hundred days of Indulgence for doing so. (p. 185.) They meditate on our Saviour's passion to gain a hundred days of Indulgence. (p. 186.) They examine their consciences, and repent of their sins, resolve to amend them, and recite the Lord's prayer, to gain the same amount of Indulgence. (p. 186.) They accompany the holy Sacrament when it is brought to the sick; endeavour to bring back into the right way those who have wandered from it; and practise other good works in honour of our Lord. And for what reason? To gain an Indulgence of a hundred days. (p. 191.) Is it considered desirable to promote the spirit of prayer? One indulgence is promised to all those who instruct the people to meditate or to offer prayer, and another to all who offer prayer every day for half or a quarter of an hour. (p. 213.) In short, there is not a good work or a devotional practice amongst you, which is not presented as a means of obtaining *Indulgences*. Your whole system depends on the popular belief in Indulgences, and the popular wish to obtain them. Your confraternities, your charitable and religious works of all kinds, are vitally dependent on them. The promise of future glory, the desire to shew love and gratitude to

[n] Bouvier, Traite des Indulgences, p. 183, 184.

Him who redeemed us with His own blood, are insufficient to excite your people to the discharge of Christian duties. They require the stimulant of *Indulgences* to rouse them into activity. And what *are* those Indulgences? Which of the Fathers ever wrote a treatise on Indulgences, or even mentioned them? Were they known to Augustine, to Chrysostom, to Gregory, or to any of the Fathers for a thousand years after Christ? You are well aware that there is a profound silence in Christian Antiquity on this subject; that the only Indulgences known for a thousand years were *remission of canonical punishments imposed in this life*. And this *novelty* it is, which now constitutes the moving power of your religion, and which usurps amongst your people that influence which Revelation assigns to Heaven and Hell—to the love and the fear of God.

Having now completed the first part of my task, and shewn that the public is not so grossly mistaken as you would persuade us, in the view which it takes of the superstitions prevalent amongst you, I return to the consideration of your Letter.

You assure us, that throughout the whole course of your residence in the Roman schools you "never heard a word that could "lead you to suppose that our blessed Lady and the Saints are, "or ought to be, the 'prominent objects of regard,' or could be "'dispensers of mercy,' nor that 'Purgatory or Indulgences "are the means of obtaining it,'" &c.; and you have, as you say, "always there heard and taught exactly the contrary." (p. 9.) In *a certain sense*, perhaps, the Professor in the Roman University may not maintain those doctrines; but I would ask, whether you have ever heard any contradiction offered by them to the scandalous and blasphemous positions which have been above cited from authorized sources? Until you have shewn this, they and you yourself must be held responsible for those positions.

You argue, from the *shortness* of the Treatises on Invocation of Saints and Purgatory in your theological course, that there could have been no intention to supersede the worship of the Trinity by the one, and the preaching of Heaven and Hell by the other. This seems to me a very bad argument, for surely we are not to judge of the practical *importance* of a doctrine by the *extent* which its discussion occupies. A Treatise on the Trinity involves many difficult questions, and therefore occupies more space than one on the Invocation of Saints. Yet

it does not follow that the Trinity itself is practically more worshipped and honoured than the Saints.

What has been just observed applies equally to the argument from your Catechisms. The Trinity, Incarnation, and Creed, may be, as you say, the principal articles of instruction. (p. 13.) They may occupy *most space*, and yet the worship of the Virgin, and the Saints, and Purgatory, may practically be "the "main subjects" put before the popular mind.

You are indignant at Mr. N.'s assertion, that, with reference to Purgatory, "the main idea really encouraged by Rome is, "that temporal punishment is a substitute for Hell in the case "of the unholy," and you characterize this doctrine ascribed to you as "wicked and fiendish." (p. 14.) What, Sir, are you not well aware, that, according to your Church, "the unholy," those who are guilty of *mortal sin*, are, by the Sacrament of Penance, *relieved from the punishment of Hell*, and made subject only to *temporal penalties?* It is your doctrine that *Hell* is the penalty annexed to mortal sins which have not been remitted by the sacrament of Penance, and that *temporal punishment* in this life or the next, follows sins which have been thus remitted. I shall not occupy your time in attempting to prove what is the well-known doctrine of your Church—a doctrine which was evidently in Mr. N.'s mind, when he employed the expressions which have excited your wrath.

Mr. N. has quoted from the Catechism of Trent the following passage, which he says, "expresses the *existing Romish doctrine*."

"There is purgatorial fire, in which the souls of the pious "are *tormented* for a certain time and expiated, in order that "an entrance may lie open to them into their eternal home, "into which nothing defiled enters."

Your reply is, that "it is unnatural and a fallacy" to "put "the Catechism *at variance* with the Council which ordered it to be drawn up"—that we must suppose persons who had been members of the Council "deliberately *contradicting* their own acts," &c. Now, Sir, the *fallacy*, permit me to say, is *all your own*. Mr. N. never adduced the Catechism of Trent as "*at* "*variance*" with the Council or as "*contradicting*" the Council. He merely adduces it as expressing "the existing "Romish doctrine," which he most correctly *distinguishes* from the Decrees of Trent, without meaning that there is any *opposition* between the two. He asserts nothing more than what you yourself admit—that it (the Catechism) "employs "*the usual language* in which a doctrine is spoken of in the "Church" of Rome. (p. 15.) That it is invested with *authori-*

ty in your Church you cannot deny, though it may not be binding on you in the same sense as the Decrees of Trent.

You quote the Theology of Perrone to shew, that Romanists are at *liberty* to speculate on the nature of Purgatory notwithstanding the Decrees of Trent. He remarks, "that questions "relating to the place, duration, and quality of the punishment "there inflicted, do not pertain to the *catholic faith*, or are *not* "*defined by the Church*." I have not Perrone's work in my possession; but I would ask, whether he does not add to the above statement, that the doctrine of a purging material fire is the general and most probable opinion of theologians? Perhaps in the next edition of your Letter you would furnish us with the entire passage. This however is clear, that "the language "of every (Roman) Catholic theologian" goes rather further than you would wish us to think. I turn to Bellarmine first. His words are, "It is *certain*, secondly, that one punishment of "Purgatory is the want of the Divine vision .... It is *certain*, "thirdly, that besides this punishment, there is also some other, "which theologians call punishment of sense (pœnam sensus). "It is *certain*, fourthly, that there is in Purgatory, *as also in* "*Hell* a *punishment of fire*, whether that fire be understood lit-"erally or metaphorically, and whether it signifies punishment "of sense, or of loss, as some prefer to say. (Certum est, quarto, "in Purgatorio, sicut etiam in Inferno, esse pœnam ignis, sive "iste ignis accipiatur propriè, sive metaphoricè, et sive signifi-"cat pœnam sensus, sive damni ut quidam volunt)." Bellarminus de Purgatorio, lib. ii. c. 10. I am afraid, Sir, that the liberty here allowed will not afford any great consolation to those who are fearful of the torments of Purgatory. Whatever they be, they are, it seems, the same sort of punishments as those of *Hell!* And this too is a matter of *certainty!*

The next chapter of Bellarmine's Treatise is thus headed, "Cap. x. Ignem purgatorii ipse *corporeum*;" and commences thus; "It is the general judgment of theologians, that *the fire* "(of Purgatory) *is truly and properly such, and of the same* "*species with our elementary fire*, (communis theologorum sen-"tentia est, verum et proprium esse ignem, et ejusdem "speciei cum nostro elementari.) Which judgment is not "indeed *de fide*, because it has no where been defined by the "Church; yea, in the Council of Florence the Greeks openly "professed that they did not admit *fire* in Purgatory, and yet "in the definition made in the last session, the existence of "Purgatory is defined, without any mention of fire. *Yet it is* "*the most probable doctrine*. (Tamen est sententia probabilis-"sima.)"

In chapter xiv. De gravitate pœnarum, we find, that "the "Fathers constantly teach that the pains of Purgatory are "*most fierce* (atrocissimas,)" and that "no pains of this life "can be compared to them, (et cum illis nullas pœnas hujus "vitæ comparandas;)" and that "in a certain sense *all* (wri- "ters and others) admit, that the pains of Purgatory *are greater* "*than those of this life*."

Such, Sir, is the doctrine of the Father of your modern theologians, "the prince of controversialists," as he is styled by your friend Mr. Phillipps; and this doctrine still continues to be that of your theologians, as Delahogue declares, when speaking of questions on the subject of Purgatory, he says, "whether "they (souls in Purgatory) be shut up in some dark prison, or "*be tortured* by some fire, as *theologians commonly hold*, (vel "igne aliquo torqueantur, ut communiter sentiunt theologi)"— "cannot be certainly affirmed." Delahogue, De Pœnitentia, p. 304.

I need not proceed further with citations from your theologians. Those will suffice to shew, that although the doctrine of a meterial and *torturing* fire in Purgatory is not an article of faith in your Church, it is by far the most probable and popular opinion, and I very much doubt whether you could point out any instances of writers or preachers in your Communion maintaining in public the *contrary doctrine*. You would yourself, I doubt not, have been regarded as a heretic, or as a person "suspected of heresy," had you ventured to maintain in Italy, that the punishment of Purgatory is not "material "fire," but the "want of the Divine Vision." The general belief and doctrine is quite opposed to such notions, and this is what is obviously meant, when it is asserted, that the doctrine of the Catechism of Trent with regard to Purgatory "expresses the *existing Romish doctrine*."

I am wearied, and I fear my readers will be wearied, with a refutation of all your errors and false-reasonings, but I must continue the ungracious task.

You send us to the statement of the Catechism of the Council of Trent with reference to *Images*, and ask, whether such statement is "an authoritative teaching which *supersedes* the "Decree of Trent," or "sanctions on the subject of images "more than *it* warrants." The Catechism, as quoted by you, says, "As the enemy of mankind, by his wiles and deceits, "seeks to pervert every the most holy institution, should the "faithful happen *at all* to offend in this particular, the pastor, "in accordance with the Decree of the Council of Trent, will "use every exertion in his power to correct such an abuse, and

"when occasion offers, *will explain the Decree itself to the* "*people, &c.*" (p. 16, 17.) Certainly, Sir, the authority of the Decree of Trent is here recognised. No one ever for a moment doubted that it was fully received in your Churches. But let me observe, that no definition whatever is given of what *really are abuses.* The people may, according to the doctrine of Alexander de Hales, Thomas Aquinas, Cajetan, Bonaventura, Marsilius, Almayn, Carthusianus, Capreolus, Vasquez, and a host of your most approved writers, pay the worship of *Latria* or *Divine honours* to the images of Christ. (Bellarm. De Imag. ii. 20.) They may, with St. Thomas Aquinas, (Summa, 3. 25. 4.) and the Schoolmen, worship the true Cross or its image with the adoration of *Latria.* They may believe in the miraculous powers of the images and relics of the Saints;—may make pilgrimages to them—may carry them in procession during plague and other public calamities; and may put their trust in them. But the Catechism of Trent does not say a word against such idolatries and superstitions. It merely refers to the Decrees of Trent, which are equally silent; and the *explanation* of those Decrees which the Priest is to give, may be *in exact accordance with the errors which I have mentioned.* So far for any safeguard supposed to be furnished by this Catechism! You refer us to what the Catechism says of the "worship of Saints." (p. 17.) Undoubtedly it recognises what all your well informed theologians *theoretically* hold—that Divine worship or Latria is not due to the Saints. No Man in his senses would gravely maintain such an absurdity. And yet notwithstanding this, the Virgin and the Saints *do practically* (and *by authority* too) receive honours due only to God

You call (p. 17.) for "the testimony of all or any of your "best writers," in favour of "preaching the blessed Virgin, the "Saints, and Purgatory," instead of "the Holy Trinity, Hea-"ven and Hell." This challenge has been answered, and if it be necessary, I can easily add a thousand other proofs. Be it observed too, that it has been answered *not merely* from the "statements of travellers," or "the assertions of the great body "of writers against you," or "popular notions of Roman Catho-"lics;" (p. 19.) but from authoritative documents, from your own approved theologians and writers.

Yes, Sir, we *do* hold that the "tacit sanction," (p. 20.) which the members of your Churches give to the idolatries and superstitions alluded to, is the deepest stain upon them. You are surrounded by notions and practices which every enlightened Christian must most deeply disapprove. You see them sanc-

tioned by the highest authorities in your Church, greedily received by the people, and endangering their salvation. And yet you give them your "tacit sanction." Which of you dares to uplift his voice, and warn the people against the delusions in which they are involved? No! This would be too great a triumph to those whom you call "heretics," and therefore you gently and in *general terms* warn them against superstitions. You never enter into particulars, or denounce this or that doctrine or practice as contrary to sound religion. We praise your caution; but is this Christian honesty? Is this the duty of Bishops? Is this even the best mode of relieving your Church from the imputations which are now thrown upon it?

You enquire whether "*any* extent of corruption or sanctioning error by the members of a Church, if at variance with its acknowledged formularies, deprives the Church of the benefit of these, and warrants its being treated as having admitted a new faith?" (p. 20.) I must profess, that to the question thus *broadly* put, none but an affirmative answer can be returned. I suppose you would not yourself deny, that a Church which openly rejected the doctrines of the Trinity, or the Divinity of Christ, even though it admitted the Nicene Creed, would be heretical. But we do not contemplate any such paradoxical case, in maintaining that the doctrines and practices taught and received by authority in your Church, *go far beyond the wording of the Decrees of Trent*. We do not pretend that the doctrines generally received amongst you *supersede* those Decrees. All that is meant is, that they *are* your doctrines, and that you have no right to fall back on the wording of the Decrees of Trent, as if you were responsible only for *them*. We cannot permit you to escape so easily.

It is in vain therefore that you attempt to involve in self-contradictions, (p. 20.) those who admit that the Western Church before the Reformation had not ceased to be a true Church, and yet maintain that the existing Roman Church sanctions and authorizes idolatrous and erroneous doctrines. There is no inconsistency in their views. They allow that the Western Church before the Reformation was deeply culpable; that most serious corruptions had become prevalent; yet still they do not deny her claim to be a part of Christ's Church, though a corrupt one; because there had been no *definition of errors, and no imposition of idolatries*, by any authority to which every member of the Church was bound to submit his own judgment. In like manner, though they see much that is erroneous, and objectionable, and presumptuous in the Decrees of the Council of Trent; and though they see idolatries and

grievous errors sanctioned by the authorities of your Church, and generally received; still they are not prepared to say, that the Churches in communion with Rome have ceased to be Christian, because it seems to them that *individuals* may and do continue in your Communion without practising or holding what is contrary to the Articles of the Christian faith. But notwithstanding this, they consider your Churches as *corrupt*, and as most deeply culpable in sanctioning corruption; and they hold you *responsible* for the errors and idolatries against which you do not protest. You will not be able to point out any inconsistency in this.

But you come to the question of *fact*, and demand what evidence there is that popular notions "go beyond a sound faith "respecting our blessed Lady?" (p. 21.) I think you have had evidence enough. Would you wish me to quote the popular formularies of devotion? They are at hand, if there be any further call for evidence. You describe to us the religious exercises of an Italian peasant, (p. 22, 23,) and forget to state, that *Indulgences* are attached to the performance of them all. In the authorized form of Christian instruction used at Rome, and complied by Cardinal Bellarmine, the only religious exercises recommended are the daily repetition of the "Pater" and "Ave," and the *Rosary of the Virgin*. The latter is thus mentioned. "M. *What* exercise have you for *keeping up devotion* (Ch' "esercizio avete per mantenere la divozione)? D. *I say the* "*Rosary of our Lady*, and I continually meditate on the fifteen "mysteries of the said Rosary, in which is contained the Life "of our Lord Jesus Christ." If, as you say, (p. 24.) your people do not think it sinful to "neglect their devotions to the "blessed Virgin," of which I should be glad to have some evidence beyond your mere assertion, it does not prove that they do not offer idolatrous prayers and worship to her.

We do not pronounce that *all* who pay honours to images "have renounced their faith, and abjured their God." (p. 25.) We have every reason, however, to fear, as well from doctrines maintained by many of your theologians and *never censured*, as from appearences (which you yourself allow to be against you, p. 24.) that very many amongst you *do* give directly idolatrous worship to images, and put their trust in them. We see no attempts made to arrest the grossest superstitions. They are *acknowledged* to be abuses, and there the matter rests.

You complain that the "*devotional feelings*" of Roman Catholics with reference to images "are taken as tests of their "*convictions and faith*." (p. 25.) I must confess that there seems to me nothing unreasonable in this test. If the

"devotional feelings" of an Italian towards the Virgin are greater then towards his God, I cannot but think that (whatever his faith may be *in theory*) the Virgin is practically his God. It is idolatry to love, or confide in, or worship any creature above God, or instead of God, or equally with God. A faith which brings forth no fruit of "devotional feelings," which permits those feelings to fix on other objects than God, is a *dead* faith.

You, who have talked so slightingly of *travellers'* accounts of religion in Romish countries, (p. 19,) should not have attempted to furnish us with anecdotes of your own. You hold up the conversation of a boy at Pæstum, as a proof, that the peasants of Italy have no exaggerated notions of the Virgin. The final question was well put, and well answered; "Could "she have redeemed you?" "Not unless her Son commanded "her." (p. 26.) This seems to you conclusive as to the soundness of the boy's faith. To me it does not. The boy may have believed that the Virgin *could redeem him* by command of the Son of God—that she was in fact his saviour, his patroness, his only hope—that his duty was to place his trust and confidence in her—and that devotion to her was sufficient for his salvation. All this he may have believed, notwithstanding his recognition of the superior Deity of Jesus Christ.

As you have favoured us with one anecdote, I shall add another, in illustration of the opinions of the middling classes of Irish Romanists.—A gentleman of strict veracity, with whom I am intimately acquainted, and from whose lips I received the following account, was one day conversing with a remarkably intelligent and respectable farmer of the Romish persuasion, a fifty pound freeholder in the county of Tipperary. The conversation turned on the Virgin Mary, when my friend enquired, "What reason Roman Catholics had for worshipping the "blessed Virgin?" The reply was, "Because she is the "*Mother* of God." "Well, but that does not prove that she "is God, or that she ought to be worshipped!" Answer. "She is the *Mother* of God, and therefore must be worshipped "as well as God. If we worship the *Son*, we must worship "the *Mother* also." "Well, but you do not mean to say that "the Virgin was the Mother of God as regards his *Divine* "*nature?* She was surely a human being before she became "the Mother of our Lord, and could she then have become "God?" This seemed to stagger the man for a moment, but he soon replied: "Oh she *is* the Mother of God, and therefore "we must worship her. This is our belief." My friend found

it impossible to dislodge him from this position; or to convince him that the Virgin Mary was in any respect inferior to our Lord himself.

As to the Roman Ritual for the Visitation of the Sick, to which you refer us, (p. 27,) it may have received comparatively little of modern addition, and may therefore retain in some degree the pure doctrines of Catholic antiquity. Is this any proof that the Virgin and Saints are not idolatrously worshipped on other occasions? Your impression of the sentiments of the lower orders of Roman Catholics during your experience "in the hospitals of the eternal city" is certainly favourable. Perhaps others might have been able to give a somewhat different account.

To your personal appeal to Mr. Newman, (p. 30,) I have nothing to say in particular. I suppose you would scarcely ask him to refrain from expressing opinions in opposition to your errors, which have been formed on a full examination of the subject. You have no right to impute to him any haste or want of consideration in what he has written. I have no doubt that he is satisfied of the truth of what he has said against you, and that he will be always prepared to maintain it.

In reply to Mr. N.'s remark, that "the only thing which can "stop this tendency [to practical idolatry] in the decrees of "Rome [about Images and Relics] as things are, is its making "some formal declaration the other way;" you ask, "What "extent of formal declaration would satisfy you?" . . . . . "In "what manner would you have the Church of Rome draw up "and promulgate a declaration that should be more satisfactory "than all those various declarations [at present existing] put "together?" (p. 31.)

I am glad, Sir, to have one point of agreement with you before I close this Letter. The difficulty you have suggested is most perplexing. It would indeed be difficult to devise any general disclaimer of superstitions which could not be evaded by the ingenuity of your theologians, and which would leave no loop-holes for idolatry and superstition. But, Sir, we will be content with a much simpler and easier mode of clearing your Church from the imputations which now so justly rest on her. Let her prelates, her clergy, and her theologians, no longer remain satisfied with assuring us that we misunderstand their religion. Let them no longer confine themselves to the attempt to hoodwink us, by appealing to the Decrees of Trent, and denying that any worship of the Virgin and Saints and any notions of Purgatory which are not there expressed are *binding* on them; as if that very circumstance did not *increase the guilt*

of those who receive and those who sanction such abuses. Let them refrain from canonizing and publishing lives of Saints crammed with the most scandalous idolatries and blasphemies. Let them protest against authorized and sanctioned abuses—prayers to Saints investing them with the attributes of Deity—worship of images pushed to idolatrous excess—Indulgences viewed as ends of Christian exertion—devotion to creatures instead of the Creator—repeated sacrifices of Christ. Let them proclaim the grand and simple sanctions of Christianity, and exhort men to look far above human inventions and the intercession of creatures, to HIM, who as God and Man is alone able to mediate with Almighty efficacy between the Creator and sinful man. Let us see this, and we shall then indeed rejoice to relieve your Church from those accusations, which we are now, in deep sorrow, compelled by Christian truth to lay to its charge. Let us see this, and there will be few if any obstacles to the restoration of that peace, which we desire, if possible, still more earnestly than yourselves.

I have the honour to remain,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

WILLIAM PALMER.

OXFORD, *April* 12, 1841.

A

SECOND LETTER

TO

N. WISEMAN, D. D.

ON THE

FOUNDATION OF THE ROMISH DOCTRINES

OF

SATISFACTIONS, INDULGENCES, PURGATORY.

AND

SUFFRAGES FOR THE DEAD.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M. A.

OF WORCESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD

BALTIMORE:
JOSEPH ROBINSON,
110 BALTIMORE STREET.

1843.

A SECOND LETTER, &c.

SIR,

You have yourself commenced the present controversy, and can therefore have no reason to complain if I pursue the path which you have opened. You have afforded an opportunity for entering on a discussion and refutation of doctrines commonly and authoritatively taught in your Communion; an opportunity which seems to bear the impress of a Providential design, and of which I avail myself with the utmost joy, under the expectation that, amidst the excitement which evidently pervades the minds of Romanists in this country, and the spirit of enquiry which exists amongst them, and which cannot in all instances be repressed, the doctrines of Scripture, of Tradition, of the Roman Church herself (rightly understood,) may be heard amongst you—heard, it may be, with rage and opposition by some—but still heard, and felt to be unanswered—heard perhaps with docility by others, and made the means of their extrication from a mass of dangerous and pernicious error, if not of their restoration to that way of salvation, the true Church of Christ, from which they are at present, under the mysterious will of God, severed.

In the name of Christian truth and sincerity I hope, that no measures may be taken by those who are in authority amongst Romanists, to check the spirit of discussion which has lately so much distinguished them. If Romanism be the truth, it will not shrink from an examination into its merits. If it be conscious of strength, it will courageously meet its opponents in the field of controversy. There will not be any attempt to *stifle* discussion and enquiry, as was the case lately, when the authorities of your Communion at Oscott, interfered to prevent the continuance of private correspondence between a clergyman in this University of the highest Church principles, and the Hon. and Rev. Mr. Spencer, which was on the point of bringing back the latter unhappy individual to the fold of Christ from which he had strayed. This most valued convert of yours came to this University brimfull of expectation he that should obtain some valuable accessions to your ranks—and he narrowly escaped being converted himself to the very Church he came to assail.

There cannot be any impropriety, any spirit of unprovoked aggression, in continuing my comments on the errors and superstitions of your Church, when it is remembered, that the Press has, for years, been teeming with the controversial publications of Romanists, inviting attention to the pretended merits of their religion, and assailing those of the Catholic Church in England; when Societies are instituted with the avowed intention of perverting the faithful to your schism; when you are loud in your boastings of the success of your system of proselytism; when you seem to "live, and move, and have your being" in assailing our Religion by every method temporal as well as spiritual; and when no views, however moderate, however orthodox, however harmonizing with those of Catholic Antiquity, can protect their advocates from your interference, and from your controversial attacks. May it not be justly enquired, "Is there "not a cause?" Is it not time to expose your sophistries, to hold up your contradictions to the world, and to drag your errors and superstitions forth into the face of day, and assail them with the weapons of Truth?

You have vainly imagined, that because the study of Catholic Antiquity has recently acquired a new importance—because men are no longer satisfied with superficial and popular systems of divinity, but view Scripture in its own light, reflected in the writings of the holy Martyrs and Saints of old; and because the primitive Church in all its parts has become the object of admiration and the model for imitation—(not always with strict judgment, I admit,) you have imagined, I say, that this movement was destined to promote your objects, and to bring converts to you. You have been buoying yourselves up with this hope, not without occasional misgivings that it might prove delusive in the end. You have indeed been *compelled* to assure your people, that men who studied Christian Antiquity, with a disposition to submit to its doctrines, could not fail to become Romanists; for had they been permitted to think any other result possible—had they been made aware that the study of Catholic Antiquity would only *rivet* men in their opposition to Romish errors, they might have been led to doubt whether those errors were really supported by Catholic tradition, as you pertinaciously and loudly assert them to be.

But, Sir, Time will dissipate these vain prognostics, these empty and baseless visions. If there has been in any instance, what might seem to afford any countenance to your hopes—if there has been, in any case, any seeming approximation to your errors, it has arisen from incaution or indiscretion of mind—from the hasty writing or thinking of men undisciplined in the crafty

and cautious language of Jesuitism—from *any thing but love of the errors of Romanism.* If I am not mistaken, (and I have more opportunities of knowing the *intentions* of the writers alluded to than you can have,) there has never been any *intention* to afford countenance to your errors and superstitions, but, on the contrary, a hearty wish to adopt the very best and soundest methods of *refuting* them. It may be, that the popular line of argument against you did not seem very judicious to the persons alluded to, and that they have sought for other and more convincing arguments. It may be, that their attention has been directed chiefly to the strengthening and beautifying of their own Church, and that they have not turned aside to assail your errors. But this, Sir, however it may excite transitory hopes, cannot long mislead you. Already you are beginning to open your eyes to the truth, and to assail those whom you professed to regard as the friends of Romanism. A little time will suffice to develop the truth more fully, and will teach the world what sort of reason you have to rejoice at the spread of Church principles.

In my former Letter, your doctrine of Indulgences and Purgatory was briefly noticed, with a view to shew, that the tenets *authorized* in the Church of Rome had not been unfairly represented. I must now invite your attention to some further observations on the same subjects, and on some other branches of your doctrines connected with them.

I need scarcely point out to your sagacity, that a vast body of your doctrines and practices to which we object, depends altogether on one principle, which is as it were the foundation-stone, the very vital essence of the whole. I mean, your doctrine of a debt still remaining due to Divine Justice after the remission of sin—the doctrine of *temporal punishments* to be endured for sin after its eternal penalty has been remitted. It is the doctrine of your Church, that by the Divine Law, temporal as well as eternal penalties are due to sin; that while the latter, together with the *guilt* of sin, are remitted in the Sacrament of Penance, the former still remain due to Divine Justice; and that they may be averted by works of satisfaction, such as prayer, fasting, and alms-deeds, and by the suffrages of the Church, especially by the sacrifice of the holy Eucharist. Let me, in order to make my meaning still clearer, extract from your own writings a very clear and accurate exposition of the doctrine in question—an exposition which is perfectly in accordance with the tenets of all your divines on this subject.

"Now let us come to the remaining part of the Sacrament "[of Penance]. We believe that upon this forgiveness of sins

"[in it], that is, after the remission of that eternal debt, which "God in his justice awards to transgressions against his law, "he has been pleased to reserve a certain degree of inferior or "temporary punishment, appropriate to the guilt which had "been incurred; and it is on this part of the punishment alone, "that, according to the Catholic doctrine, satisfaction can be "made to God. What the grounds of this belief are, I will "state just now. At present, I wish to lay down the doctrine "clearly and intelligibly; that it is only with regard to the re-"served degree of temporal punishment that we believe the "Christian can satisfy the justice of God[a]."

I must also avail myself of your subsequent description of the Romish doctrine on this subject.

"The doctrine which is thus collected from the word of "God, is reducible to these heads: 1. That God, after the re-"mission of sin, retains a lesser chastisement in his power, to "be inflicted on the sinner. 2. That penitential works, fast-"ing, alms-deeds, contrite weeping, and fervent prayer, have "the power of averting that punishment. 3. That this scheme "of God's justice was not a part of the imperfect law, but the "unvarying ordinance of his dispensation, anterior to the "Mosaic Ritual, and amply confirmed by Christ in the Gospel. "4. That it consequently becomes a part of all true repentance "to try to satisfy this Divine justice, by the voluntary assump-"tion of such penitential works, as his revealed truth assures "us have efficacy before him."

"These propositions contain the Catholic doctrine concerning "Satisfaction[b]."

This, Sir, is a very fair and correct statement of the doctrines taught in all parts of your Church[c], and it is quite *consistent* with the following decrees of the Council of Trent; though in this, as in other cases, your authorized doctrines go beyond the definitions of that Conventicle.

"If any one saith, that the *whole* punishment is always re-"mitted with the *guilt* [of sin] by God, and that the satisfac-"tion of penitents is nothing but the faith by which they lay "hold on Christ's satisfaction for them; Let him be Anathema.

[a] Lectures on principal doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church, vol. ii. p. 41, 42.

[b] Ibid. p. 47.

[c] Vide Catechism. Concil Trident. Pars ii. De Pœnitentiæ Sacramento, c. xc; Bellarmin. De Pœnitentiæ, l. iv. c ii. Tournely, De Pœnit. t. ii. p. 3; Bouvier, De Pœnit. p. 128, &c. 280; Trevern, Discussion Amicale, t. ii. p. 205: Milner, End of Controversy, Letter xlii; Hornyhold, Real Principles of Catholics (on Penance); Faith of Catholics by Berrington and Kirk, p. 339. Walenburch. Opera, t. ii. p. 19; &c.

"If any one saith, that no *satisfaction* is made to God for "sins, as to their *temporal punishment*, through the merits of "Christ, by punishments inflicted by Him [God] and patiently "endured, or enjoined by the Priest (not spontaneously under- "taken), such as fasting, prayer, almsgiving, or other works "of piety; and therefore that the best penitence is only a new "life; Let him be Anathema.

"If any one saith, that the keys of the Church are only "given to lose and not to bind also, and therefore that Priests, "in imposing punishments on those who confess, act contrary "to the *end* of the keys and the ordinance of Christ, and that "it is a fiction that in virtue of the keys, *temporal punishment* "*remains, for the most part, to be discharged, after eternal* "*punishment has been removed;* Let him be Anathema[d]."

It might naturally be objected to this doctrine, that the Sacrament of Baptism also remits sin, and yet there is no reserve of *temporal* punishment in this case; so that it seems unreasonable to suppose that when sins are remitted by the Sacrament of Penance, their temporal penalties are made an exception to the general amnesty. But the Council of Trent has its answer to this objection in the following terms.

"The nature of Divine justice seems to require, that they "who have sinned ignorantly before baptism, should be received "into favour in a different mode from those, who having been "once delivered from the service of sin and of the Devil, and "having received the gift of the Holy Ghost, have not feared "knowingly to violate the temple of God, and to grieve the "Holy Ghost. And it befits the Divine clemency, not to par- "don our sins without any satisfaction, lest we should take "occasion to suppose our sins light, and committing injury and "insult against the Holy Ghost, should fall into more grievous "sins, laying up for ourselves wrath in the day of wrath[e]."

I trust, Sir, you will admit that I have endeavoured to give the fullest and most authentic exposition of the doctrine of your Church in reference to temporal penalties and satisfactions. Your own statements on the subject are, as I can attest, entirely in accordance with those of all your theologians, and they exactly harmonize with the doctrines of the Council of Trent. There can therefore be no mistake as to what the belief of Romanists really is on these points.

Now, Sir, I have already said, that a large body of your doctrines and practices to which we object, depends on the doctrine

[d] Concil. Trident. Sessio xiv.
[e] Sessio xiv. cap. viii.

of temporal punishment, and the necessity of satisfying for it by penitential works. This is stated correctly by one of your titular bishops, Dr. Hornyhold, as follows.

"'The *eternal* pain is forgiven [in the Sacrament of Penance], "but the *temporal* pain commonly remains, as it appears both "from the necessity of the thing, the instance of David, who "was punished by the death of his children after his sins were "forgiven, 2 Kings xii; and other instances of temporal calami- "ties inflicted for offences though pardoned. *And this method* "*of temporal pain* IS THE FOUNDATION OF OUR FAITH *as to sa-* "*cramental Satisfaction, Indulgences, Purgatory, and Prayer* "*for the dead*[f]."

It does not appear evident at first view, how your doctrine of Satisfaction, Purgatory, Indulgences, Masses, and Suffrages or Prayers for the dead, are connected together; and how *vitally* they all depend on the doctrine of temporal penalties above mentioned. Bear with me then, while I trace the mutual connexion and dependence of these doctrines and practices.

Your Church lays it down as a broad and general principle, that temporal punishment is still due to the Divine justice for sins, after their eternal punishment has been remitted in the Sacrament of Penance. This is the first step.

Secondly, you maintain, that such temporal punishments may be averted by *Satisfactions* or works of Penance, such as fasting, alms, and prayers, which according to you, satisfy, expiate, or atone for the temporal punishments due to Divine justice.

Thirdly, you argue, that as temporal penalties are absolutely due to Divine justice; if they are not redeemed or expiated in this life by works of penance, they must be endured in the next life, and this is your doctrine of *Purgatory*.

Fourthly, you believe, that the Church has the power of remitting such temporal punishments in this life or in Purgatory by *Indulgences*, in which the merits of Christ and (as many of you hold) of the Saints, are applied to the supply of your deficiency in works of Satisfaction.

Fifthly, you conceive, that as there may be doubts whether the conditions on which Indulgences are given are really fulfilled, and as there may be other reasons for questioning whether a real remission of temporal punishment has been obtained by Indulgences in any particular case, it is necessary to *continue* works of Satisfaction, as if Indulgences had not been granted, and to obtain the Suffrages or Prayers of the Church,

[f] Hornyhold, Real Principles of Catholics, p. 277, 278. Ed. London, 1749.

especially the *sacrifice of the Mass*, which you believe to have great efficacy in remitting the temporal punishments of the living and dead.

Sixthly, you believe, that *one person may perform satisfactory works for another*, and thus obtain the remission or diminution of his temporal punishment in this life or in Purgatory, and that he may also acquire the remissions of temporal punishment conveyed by Indulgences, and apply them to the relief of the dead in the tortures of Purgatory, or even to their delivery from those dreaded regions.

From this, Sir, it is evident, that your doctrine of *Temporal punishment* is the very life-blood, the vital sap, the foundation, the key-stone of your system on all these points. Take this doctrine away, and the whole machinery of your Church is broken asunder. Your Purgatory, your Satisfactions, your Indulgences, your Masses for the dead, Confraternities, privileged altars, scapularies, and beads, medals, and crucifixes, with the whole paraphernalia of indulgenced rites, objects, and prayers, are scattered to the winds. This, Sir, is the root from which springs a huge and fearful mass of superstition, choking and obscuring the pure faith which still lingers among you; and in assailing this error and its branches, which like serpents have clung round your Catholic faith, and by their poisonous breath have been destroying its children, I have no other object than to restore the ancient Roman faith—the faith of the holy Catholic Church—that faith which has always existed, and which, by virtue of the Saviour's promise, shall prevail over "the gates of Hell," over all the machinations of the Powers of Darkness.

Let us come then to the examination of the basis on which this doctrine rests. Let us enquire what reasons you can furnish for believing, that by a general law of God, temporal penalties remain due to Divine justice after sin has been remitted, and that such penalties can be averted.

1. You appeal in the first place to what passes within our minds; I quote from your own writings.

"Is it God's ordinance, that *when he has forgiven sins*, and "so justified the sinner as to place him once more in a state of "grace, he still *reserves* the infliction of some degree of punish-"ment for his transgressions? We say, that *undoubtedly* it "is; and I would appeal, in the first instance, to the *feelings* of "any individual; and I do not believe there is any one, how-"ever he may think himself in a state of favour before God—

"however he may flatter himself that his sins are taken away "—who will not answer the appeal. *Why is it that, when "calamity falls upon him, he receives it as a punishment for "his sins?* Why do our natural *feelings* prompt us to consider "our *domestic and personal afflictions as sent by God for our "transgressions*, although, at the moment when affliction "comes, we may not be *conscious* of lying under actual guilt? "This is a *feeling* which pervades every form of religion, and "more naturally that of Christ; because it is impossible to be "familiar with the word of God, without receiving an impres- "sion that he does visit the sins of men on their heads, although "they may have endeavoured, with reasonable hope, to obtain "their forgiveness. . . . It is imposible not, more or less, to con- "nect the idea of suffering inflicted, with that of sin com- "mitted[g]."

You will excuse me, Sir, if I cannot admit the propriety of making any appeal, *in the first instance*, to our natural *feelings*, where a grand principle of religion is in question. If our natural feelings be *in accordance* with the doctrines revealed by God, and conveyed to us by the united voice of Scripture and Catholic Tradition, we may indeed use them as an *additional* argument in favour of the Truth; but if they are adopted as our guides and directors in the interpretation of the word of God; if they are put forward in *the first instance* to bias our minds, you must permit me to say, that, considering our natural inclination to evil, and the temptations of the Devil by which we are perpetually assailed, such a method seems eminently calculated to involve us in all sorts of errors and heresies.

I must therefore protest against your appealing in the first instance to our "natural feelings," when the real question is whether a certain principle has been revealed by God.

But, Sir, I am ready and willing to meet you on the ground you have selected. I fully admit that our natural feelings prompt us to connect in some cases the notion of temporal calamities suffered, with that of sin committed and *unrepented of*. We need not look to Scripture and contemplate the case of a world destroyed by the flood for its sins, of Sodom perishing in fire and brimstone, and of the Jews scattered amidst all nations for their rejection of the Saviour; for we may see with our own eyes, that Divine Providence does *sometimes* make bare its arm, and visibly punish wicked individuals and nations. But, Sir, if we do see this, we also frequently see Vice and

[g] Lectures on the Doctrines, &c. of the Catholic Church, vol. ii. p. 42.

Sin triumphant in this world, and we see Virtue and Religion pining in misery and affliction, persecuted, overwhelmed with insults and torments, and lifting their eyes in meek resignation and inward joy to the sublime rewards which are promised to those that suffer for Christ. Need I call to your remembrance the Saints of old, of whom the blessed Apostle Paul writes thus: "They were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that "they might obtain a better resurrection; and others had trial "of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and "imprisonment: they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, "were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered "about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, "tormented; *of whom the world was not worthy*: they wan- "dered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens, and caves of "the earth." Heb. xi. 35—38. No one can venture to say that these temporal afflictions were endured by the Saints for their *sins;* they were *trials* of their faith, patience, love of God. Listen again to the words of our Lord Himself: "*Bless-* "*ed* are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you, and "shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. "Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for *great* is your reward in "heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets which were be- "fore you." And again, "These things have I spoken unto "you, that in me ye might have peace. *In the world ye shall* "*have tribulation;* but be of good cheer, I have overcome the "world." Hear the words of St. Paul: "My son, despise not "thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art re- "buked of Him: *for whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth,* and "*scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.*" Attend also to the language of St. Peter, the first of the Apostles, "Now for a "season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temp- "tations: *that the trial of your faith,* being much more pre- "cious than of gold that perisheth though it be tried with fire, "*might be found unto praise, and honour, and glory,* at the "appearing of Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. i. 6, 7.

It is evident then, that temporal calamities are in many cases, nay as a *general rule,* inflicted on the true disciples of Christ, in order to *try* and strengthen their faith, and to procure for them a greater degree of glory, honour, and praise in the eternal and heavenly kingdom of Christ. And, Sir, this might have been anticipated from the life of Him whom we in common adore, and whom we regard as the grand example to whom our lives ought to be conformed. No being that ever partook of human nature was so severely afflicted with temporal as well as spiritual sorrows and calamities as He who redeemed

the world; and yet, none but Himself was ever free from the taint of all sin, original as well as actual. This one example is an irrefragable proof, that temporal calamities and torments are not *necessarily*, in any way, the results of sin committed by him who suffers them.

You cannot deny the truth of this principle without heresy. You *do* not expressly deny it in your argument. But I have brought it thus distinctly forward, because it seems to me that Romanists generally, in their consideration of the afflictions of good men, seem inclined to forget the reason assigned for them by the word of God, and to suppose that they are all intended as *punishments of sin*. Nothing can be more injurious to God than such a notion. It represents Him in the attitude of a severe *Judge* instead of a loving *Parent*—a Parent who educates his children for higher glory by a more rigid discipline. In opposition to such errors, I lay down the following proposition as an Article of Catholic faith deduced directly from the word of God: "THAT TEMPORAL AFFLICTIONS AND CALAMI-"TIES ARE COMMONLY IMPOSED BY GOD'S MERCY ON THE "JUSTIFIED, IN ORDER THAT THEY MAY OBTAIN A GREATER "AND MORE GLORIOUS REWARD."

Now, Sir, I come to your arguments from our "*feelings*." You imagine, "*that when calamity falls upon*" any one who thinks himself in a state of favour before God, "he receives it "as a *punishment for his sins*."—You assert, that "our natural "feelings prompt us to consider our *domestic and personal* "*afflictions*, as sent by God *for our transgressions*"—that "it "is *impossible* not, more or less, to connect the idea of *suffering* "*inflicted*, with that of *sin committed*." I have no doubt, Sir, that yourself and other Romanists are in the habit of regarding such temporal afflictions of the justified as punishments for their past sins; but I must say, that any one who enters into the spirit of the word of God; any one who can appreciate the glorious and merciful objects of a Heavenly Father in those afflictions, will view them in a widely different light. The carnal and ignorant may see in them nothing but exactions of Divine *justice*, penalties for sin *partially forgiven*. But the spiritual mind will trace in them the discipline of LOVE, not inflicting penalties for the past, but preparing the way for a more glorious futurity.

Such afflictions therefore are to be regarded as signs of love, not of vengeance. They are to be desired more than dreaded. They are to be endured, not expiated. If they are not endured, the Christian suffers loss. If they are removed, his reward is less. If you fast, and pray, and with many tears beseech God

to remove from you these temporal calamities, you may indeed prevail, though one might almost doubt whether any prayer like this, proceeding from a heart unable to appeciate the Divine mercy, would be heard. The case of the inhabitants of Gadara however shews, that God will hear the prayers of those who intreat Him to "depart out of their coasts;" and it may be apprehended that He will also hear the prayers of those who ignorantly pray that his *grace* of afflictive dispensations may be removed from them—of those who regard his graces as calamities, his works of love as punishments.

You spend your lives in endeavouring to avert these *temporal afflictions*, which you regard as so many exactions of God's justice. It is very true that you regard them as *punishments for sin*, and that they therefore appear to you in a most formidable light. But still you *really* are endeavouring to avert what is not a punishment for sin, but a mark of God's favour. The temporal afflictions of the righteous are seen by you in a false light. You think them judgments, while thay are really mercies.

But you will answer, when thus pressed, that you *do* admit that temporal evils are frequently intended for spiritual blessings, though you hold that they are also often intended as punishments of sin remitted; and that it is not your design to avert them in the former sense, but in the latter.

I would enquire then, first, (admitting your doctrine for the sake of argument,) what means you have of determining that such temporal evils may not be, at once, punishments for sins past, and means of future improvement and reward? *If they be so*, you inflict an injury on yourselves by seeking to avert them, and yet you cannot deny that the case is possible.

Secondly, I ask, whether such temporal evils, if they are (as you imagine) inflicted for the punishment of sin remitted as regards its greater penalties, may not be *necessary* to preserve ourselves from falling again into sin, or *necessary* for the instruction of others? And here again is a reason why we should not earnestly labour to avert such temporal evils; because in so doing we may be only interfering with our own salvation or that of the brethren, and counteracting the designs of God.

So much for your appeal to our "feelings," and to the supposed connexion between temporal suffering and *sin*. If you persist in asserting that temporal afflictions have a necessary connexion with sin, you accuse our Saviour himself of sin, and fall into damnable heresy.

II. I now turn to the proofs which you adduce from Scripture in support of your doctrine. And here let me be permitted to state the question more clearly.

It is not in question then, whether temporal penalties are, in the order of God's providence, (especially under the former dispensations,) due to, and inflicted on, *sin;* but whether they are, under the Gospel, due to sin *remitted and pardoned.*

Hence you will at once admit, that it would be the merest sophistry and folly to attempt to prove your doctrine from the simple fact, that temporal penalties for sin have been inflicted on *sinners* under the old or new dispensations, while the question is whether they have been inflicted on *pardoned* sinners.

In considering the testimonies which have been advanced in support of your view, I must here turn from your scanty collection of scriptural examples, to the fuller and more systematic argument of Tournely. He collects "those places of Scripture "which signify that God, *after the pardon of sin,* still requires "an *avenging* temporal punishment (ultricem pœnam tempora-"lem) from the penitent."

"The example of David (2 Kings [Samuel] xii,) is especially "remarkable. For although Nathan had heard from the pro-"phet (verse 13,) 'The Lord also hath put away thy sin; "thou shalt not die,' he immediately adds, 'Howbeit, because "by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of "the Lord to blaspheme, the child also that is born unto thee "shall surely die;' and verse 10, 'Now therefore the sword "shall never depart from thine house; because thou hast de-"spised me, and hast taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be "thy wife.' God remits on one side the guilt and *eternal pun-"ishment;* but on the other he requires *temporal punishment* "as well from the son as the father himself, not merely for the "discipline and amendment of David, and the example of "others, as the Innovators and especially Daillé commonly re-"ply, but also for the punishment and chastisement of pardoned "sin. 'Because by this deed thou hast given occasion to the "enemies of the Lord to blaspheme. . . . . Because thou hast "despised me,' saith the holy context, which particle 'Because' "denotes that the *sin* of David was the real *cause* of all the "evils which he suffered, and not merely their *occasion,* as "Daillé cavils: for with what more significant terms could "Scripture have expressed the *cause?*" (Tournely, De Pœnit. t. ii. p. 4.)

You will admit, Sir, that this is as clear and cogent an argument as can well be deduced from this passage in favour of your view. Let us now consider it more closely. It is obvious, therefore, that God by Nathan remitted the extreme punishment which was due to David's sin, "Thou shalt not die," and that at the same time He imposed a lesser temporal punish-

ment ~~which was due to David's sin, "Thou shalt not die," and that at the same time He imposed a lesser temporal punishment.~~ for his sin, "The child that is born unto thee shall surely die." But, Sir, I must deny that this example furnishes any necessary proof that a similar mode of proceeding characterizes the present dealings of God with us. A temporal penalty of some sort was necessary when God *visibly* interfered in the affairs of men. But now that his guidance is entirely spiritual and invisible, temporal penalties are no longer necessary in the same way; and had David lived under the Christian dispensation, his crime might not have involved such consequences when truly repented of. Under the former dispensation the case was widely different. Had the favoured servant of God, the chosen pastor of God's people, been permitted to commit most grievous and *scandalous* sins, without any visible signs of God's indignation, the most fatal results must have followed. The justice of God would have been impugned. Sin would have been encouraged.

From all this it is plain, that no inference can be deduced from the above passage in proof of your tenets. But, Sir, there *is* a doctrine clearly taught by this example, and by the subsequent conduct of David, which is fatal to your view. We learn from it, that such temporal penalties inflicted for sin *cannot be averted.* Was the threatened punishment of David averted by his prayers, fastings, tears, prostrations, and other works of "*satisfaction?*" No! *The child died.* How vain therefore is it for you to imagine that such temporal penalties of sin can be averted! Observe too, that when temporal punishments were afterwards sent to David in the case of Absalom, and of the numbering of the people, he did *not attempt to avert them* by any works of satisfaction. He submitted to the Divine will, and his example is meant to teach us the duty of submission to all similar dispensations of God.

Tournely continues thus:

"In the same II Book of Kings [Samuel] c. xxiv, although "God had pardoned David's sin, which he had committed in "numbering the people, yet in verse 12, a *remaining* punish-"ment is set forth to be discharged, and he is given the option "of war, famine, or the plague." (Tournely, ibid.)

On this argument I must observe, first, that there is no evidence whatever that God had *pardoned* David's sin. It is true indeed that David "said unto the Lord, I have sinned greatly "in that I have done; and now, I beseech thee, O Lord, take "away the iniquity of thy servant: for I have done very foolishly." But all we know of the *result* is, that God offered

him the choice of three grievous penalties. There is not any allusion to God's having *pardoned* his sin when the penalty was inflicted. Consequently this passage does not relate to the question before us. If it did, however, if David's sin had been pardoned when the Prophet offered him the choice of war, pestilence, or famine, the conclusion would be fatal to your doctrine. *The punishment was inflicted,* and David instructed by the case of Uriah, that such punishments *could not be averted by any works of satisfaction or penance,* submitted himself to the Divine will.

Tournely continues: "In the 32d chapter of Exodus, when "Moses interceded with God not to destroy the whole people "on account of their crime in adoring the golden calf, God is "said to have been appeased verse 14, yet in verse 34 God "saith, 'Nevertheless, in the day when I visit I will visit "their sin upon them.'" (Ibid.)

In this case God evidently *did not forgive* the sin of the children of Israel, He only *commuted* the sentence of utter destruction which He had pronounced against that people for their idolatry, into chastisements of a different character, at the prayer and intercession of Moses. There is no evidence that the people repented and were *forgiven* their sin. On the contrary, the Lord said unto Moses, in reply to his entreaties for their forgiveness, "Whosoever hath sinned against me, *him "will I blot out of my book.*" (verse 33.) And in sign of his wrath we find, that "the Lord *plagued* the people, because "they made the calf, which Aaron made." (verse 35.) What advantage then can you derive from this passage? It is adduced to prove that *sins pardoned* are subject to temporal punishment. But the sin of the children of Israel here mentioned was *not pardoned.*

I return to Tournely. "In the 14th chapter of Numbers, "the Lord was angry at the murmuring of the people, and was "so appeased by the prayer of Moses as to say, (ver. 20.) 'I "have pardoned according to thy word;' yet adds, (ver. 22.) "'All those men which have seen my glory and my miracles "which I did .... shall not see the land.'" (Ibid.)

In this case it is obvious, that the "pardon" granted by God did not imply the forgiveness of the *sin* committed, and the *justification* of those who had committed it, for He speaks of the congregation as those that "have *tempted* me now these "ten times, and *have not hearkened* to my voice," (ver. 22.); "them that *provoked* me," (ver. 23.); "this *evil* congregation "which murmur against me," (ver. 27.) He says, "Your "little ones .... shall know the land which *ye have despised,*"

(ver. 31.) "Each day for a year shall ye *bear your iniquities*," (ver. 34.) "I the Lord have said, I will surely do it unto all "this *evil congregation that are gathered together against me*," (ver. 35.) Such is the language of God to the congregation of Israel *after* he had "pardoned" them, (ver. 20.) And it is plain therefore that this pardon was not a remission of *their sin*, but a remission of the *immediate destruction by pestilence*, and the *disinheritance* which God had threatened, (ver. 12.) The temporal punishments then with which they were visited, were not punishments of *sin remitted*—punishments of the *justified*. They were chastisements of unbelieving and impenitent sinners. Is this the interpretation of unaided human reason? Is it not the interpretation of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where speaking of those that fell in the wilderness in consequence of this Divine decree, he says, "To whom "sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them "that *believed not*? So we see that they could not enter in "because of their *unbelief*," (Hebr. iii. 18, 19.) And is it this *unbelieving*, this *impenitent*, this *evil* congregation, that you would hold up as a proof that temporal penalties are inflicted on the *believing* and *justified* penitent.

I return to your proofs. "Add to these those places of "Scripture in which just and holy men declare that they are "punished and afflicted in this life for their sins,—doubtless "*past and already pardoned by God*. Thus Tobias, c. iii. v. "4. said, 'Because we have not obeyed thy commandments. "therefore we have been delivered for a spoil, and unto cap- "tivity, and unto death, and for a proverb of reproach to all the "nations among which we are dispersed. Deal not with me "according to *my sins* and my father's, &c.'" (Tournely, Ibid.)

There is no evidence whatever that Tobias, in offering this prayer, believed that his sins *had been pardoned*. On the contrary, his prayer infers throughout, that he believed himself *still* subject to God's *displeasure for sin*, and to the punishment which resulted from it. He prays God "not to punish him "for his sins and ignorances," (ver. 3.) evidently supposing that he was still liable to the *full* measure of penalty due to them. This passage therefore cannot afford any support to your doctrine of a *portion* of the punishment due to sin remaining after the greater part of its penalties have been remitted, and after the sin has been remitted, and the sinner *justified* by the Sacrament of Penance.

"In the third chapter of Daniel, v. 28. the three children "placed in the furnace say, 'In truth and in judgment thou "hast brought on us all these things, *because of our sins*,'" *&c.* (Tournely, ibid.)

I might object to this passage at once, as an interpolation, and as forming no part of the word of God, because it is not found in the Hebrew original of the Book of Daniel. But it is needless for my purpose to do so; because it is evident from these words and from the whole context, that the three children believed that their sins *had not been remitted*, and consequently the case has nothing to do with your doctrine.

"The wise man pronounces generally (Proverbs iii. 12.) that '"whom the Lord loveth he correcteth; even as a father the "son whom he delighteth.' The same is said, Hebr. xii. 6. "and Rev. iii. 19." (Tournely, ibid.)

Certainly, the Lord does intend temporal afflictions as marks of *love* to the justified. This is exactly what we contend for. We view them as a discipline of love, intended to promote the glory and happiness of believers. You regard them as modes of Divine *vengeance* for sin *already pardoned*. Which of these two doctrines is the most consistent with the passages just quoted? Which is most calculated to sweeten the afflictions of the world? Which is most conducive to the glory of God? Which is most calculated to cause love of God and dependence on Him? I am content to leave this to the conscience of my readers, and of yourself.

But I must now endeavour to collect your remaining arguments from Scripture, for the purpose of seeing the utmost extent of what can be said in maintenance of your principle. I turn then to Bellarmine, and glean from his pages what follows.

He argues, "that *death itself* is often inflicted as the penalty "of sin, even after its guilt has been remitted," from Genesis ii. 'In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;' and Rom. v. 'By one man sin entered into the world, and 'death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, in whom all 'have sinned.' Death then is the punishment of original sin, and yet the guilt and eternal penalty of original sin is remitted by baptism. Thus all men suffer temporal penalties for sin remitted[h].

In reply to this we may most fully admit, that death is the penalty of *original sin;* but we deny that any argument can be drawn from this to prove that temporal penalties are inflicted on *actual sins* after they have been pardoned. For if all men suffer death for original sin, it is for the sin of *Adam* imputed to them, and not for any sin committed *by themselves*. So that sins which *we ourselves* commit, may be free from any temporal penalties after their remission. All then that can be collected

[h] Bellarmine. De Pœnitentia, lib. iv. c. ii.

from the fact alleged by Bellarmine is, that God *might, if he pleased*, inflict temporal penalties on our actual sins after they were remitted. This we fully concede in the abstract, though we do not conceive it consistent with the actual scheme of redemption. But the question is, whether *He has really made such a regulation*, and there is no proof here that He has done so.

Another argument is deduced from the penalty awarded to Moses and Aaron for their sin at the water of Meribah, when God declared to them that they should not enter the promised land. (Numbers xx. 12.) And accordingly Aaron died in Mount Hor, (ver. 28.) and Moses in Mount Nebo, (Deut. xxxiv. 5.) Yet no one will deny that Moses and Aaron were restored to the favour of God after their sin at Meribah[i].

To this it may be replied, that as Moses and Aaron had not believed God "to sanctify Him in the eyes of the children of "Israel," (Numb. xx. 12.) and had thus *publicly* offended against God, it was essentially necessary that some mark of Divine displeasure against their sin should be inflicted; because God at that time ruled his people by a system of temporal rewards and punishments, and guided them in a direct and visible manner. But under the Christian dispensation He no longer does so and therefore sins equal to that of Moses need not necessarily be visited by temporal penalties. The justice and sanctity of his government no longer demand any such dispensations. The conduct of Moses and Aaron however concur to prove what is fatal to your view, for they did not seek to *avert* the threatened penalty in any way, and the penalty itself was strictly and literally exacted.

The only other argument which seems worthy of notice is from 1 Kings xiii.—the case of the Prophet who was slain by a lion on account of his sins; and yet, as Bellarmine argues, "it cannot be doubtful that he requested and obtained pardon "from the Lord; for in proof of the *sanctity* in which he had "died, the lion stood near the body without eating it, and did "not dare even to touch the prophet's ass[k]."

[i] Bellarmine, ibid.

[k] Ibid. Bouvier, Bishop of Maus, adds one other argument, from the circumstance of Adam's suffering death for his sin, though that sin had doubtless been pardoned (De Pœnit p. 128.) But it must be remembered, that in this case God was bound by his own positive *promise*, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt *surely die*." God is not bound by any similar promise under the Gospel to inflict temporary penalties or death for our sins. Consequently the punishment of Adam proves nothing.

This is just as good a proof of the sanctity of the *ass* as of the prophet. The lion touched neither: therefore the one and the othes died in sanctity! What folly is this! The plain reason of the miracle was to shew that this penalty was distinctly the work of God—to furnish an undeniable proof of his punishment of disobedience.

These, Sir, are your proofs from Scripture. They are the proofs adduced by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, by Bellarmine, Tournely, Delahogue, Bouvier, Milner, Hornyhold, yourself, and all your writers. And now what can they avail you? The passages which all your most eminent theologians have brought from Scripture either subvert your doctrine, or utterly fail to prove its truth. They either speak of the temporal penalties of sin *not pardoned*, or they relate to circumstances when temporal and visible penalties were *necessary* in the Divine economy; or they shew that temporal afflictions are not *penalties of sin*. Produce if you can any other and better proofs from Scripture, and I shall be ready to discuss them; but do not weary us by the repetition of refuted arguments.

III. I would here gladly enter on the discussion of certain passages from the Fathers which have been adduced in favour of your doctrine, and demonstrate from them the falsity of that very doctrine; but space fails me at present; and this discussion is not, strictly speaking, necessary; because if you are *manifestly* devoid of any scriptural proofs for your doctrine, it cannot, according to the doctrine laid down by Veron[l], Bossuet, and many of your most eminent theologians, (in accordance with the whole body of the Fathers[m],) be any *article of faith;* and consequently your doctrines of Satisfactions, Purgatory, and Indulgences, built upon it, cannot be articles of faith; and the Council of Trent must have erred in declaring them articles of faith.

But, Sir, I have not yet concluded my task, which would be incomplete if it were limited merely to a refutation of your

[l] Veron, in his Regula Fidei, cap. i. sect. 2. says, that "*two things must be united* in order that any doctrine should be an article of the Catholic faith: one, that it be revealed of God by the prophets, apostles, or canonical authors; the other, that it be proposed by the Church."

[m] See Treatise on the Church, vol. ii. p. 10—17. Newman on Romanism, Lect. xiii. Usher's Answer to a Jesuit, c. ii. Taylor's Dissuasive, p. ii. b. i. s. ii. And the Norrisian prize Essay for this year, by the Rev. D. A. Beaufort, M. A. (Parker, London.)

arguments in defence of the doctrine of temporal penalties. There are specific objections to that doctrine, which must now be offered to your notice.

Your belief then is, that Divine *justice* exacts the debt of temporal punishment for sin, after its eternal punishment has been remitted. You do not imagine that the *mercy* or *love* of God demands these penalties. No:—it is (as all your writers say) the *justice* of God which is to be satisfied by temporal penalties.

Let me establish this by some citations from your own writings. You say, "It is only with regard to the reserved degree "of temporal punishment that we believe the Christian can "satisfy the *justice* of God[n]." . . . "This scheme of God's *jus-* "*tice* was not a part of the imperfect law, but the unvarying "ordinance of his dispensation anterior to the Mosaic ritual, and "amply confirmed by Christ in the Gospel." . . "It conse- "sequently becomes a part of true repentance to try to satisfy "this *Divine justice* by the voluntary assumption of such peni- "tential works." . . . "These propositions contain the *Catholic* "*doctrine* concerning Satisfaction[o]." I need scarcely say, that the language of all writers of your Communion is exactly similar; and it is obviously necessary that it should be so, for if temporal *punishments* are due for remitted sin, they can only be due to Divine *justice*.

Now if Divine *justice* still remains to be satisfied after the remission of sin, it must require what is *in justice* due to sin, that is, *eternal punishment*, and consequently the remission of sin is, according to your doctrine, a mere name. So that your doctrine is absolutely subversive of its own foundation, and of the foundation of the Christian's hopes.

And besides this, Divine *justice* which demands an *infinite* punishment for sin, cannot receive any finite or limited punishments in part payment of the debt due to it. It demands an infinite punishment—a punishment not made up of parts—a punishment *infinitely* greater than all that human imagination could even *conceive*. To imagine therefore that the punishment due to Divine and Infinite *justice* for sin can be divided or separated into eternal and temporal; and that *temporal* and eternal punishments *together* satisfy the justice of God; is as absurd as it would be to imagine, that a grain of sand, *together with the universe*, make up Infinity. It is to suppose that Infinite *justice* can require what is, in comparison, less than the least of things, *in addition* to an infinite penalty.

[n] Lectures on the principal doctrines, &c. of the Catholic Church, vol. ii. p. 42.

[o] Ibid. p. 47.

But Divine justice has received an adequate sacrifice. The merits of our Saviour Christ, both God and man, were equal to the demands of Divine justice, and they were accepted. Henceforth the *justice* of God was appeased; and it has no claims on those to whom the infinite merits of Christ have been applied by true repentance. They may rest in confidence on the mercy of God, knowing indeed that many temporal calamities will befal them, according to the promise of Christ; but not regarding those calamities as exactions of God's *justice partially satisfied*. They know that unrepented sin may again make them liable to God's judgments in this world and in eternity. But they firmly believe that an infinite atonement has been made for sins which demanded an infinite punishment, and as they believe that Divine *justice* has been fully and entirely satisfied, they also believe that it can have *no further claims*. Consequently the doctrine that temporal punishment can be due to the *justice* of God for sin remitted through Christ, is to them an impossibility. Did they reckon themselves still liable, when justified, to demands from God's *justice*, the very foundation of their hope of salvation would be shattered to pieces.

But, Sir, dangerous and pernicious as your doctrine on this point has been proved, I have not yet disclosed its crowning absurdity and wickedness. It is the doctrine of the Council of Trent itself, that "*Justification* is not remission of sin merely, "but also *santification*, and the renewal of the inner man by "the voluntary reception of *grace and divine gifts*; so that he "who was unrighteous is made *righteous*, and the enemy be-"comes a *friend*, and *an heir* according to the hope of eternal "life . . . when a man is justified, and *united to Jesus Christ*, "he receives, together with the remission of sins, the following "gifts bestowed upon him at the same time, namely, *faith*, "*hope*, and *charity*[p]."

Justification is then something more than the mere remission of sins—it is the restoration of the sinner to a state of grace, to union with his God, to all the glorious privileges of a "child "of God."

And yet, Sir, in the face of this most undoubted truth—in the face of their own belief, and the belief of the Roman Church —your writers have the almost incredible folly and wickedness to assert, that the justified and beloved children of God *are* liable to the Divine *wrath* and *vengeance!* Yes. It is their doctrine, that temporal punishments are exacted from a justified believer by the *vengeance* of God. Let me produce the follow-

[p] Concil. Trid. Sess. vi. cap. vii.

ing proofs. Your celebrated controversialists, Bishops Adrian and Peter de Walenburch, write thus: "Since holy Scripture "shews by many examples, that God after remitting the guilt "and eternal punishment of sins, chastises sinners with tempo- "ral punishments, Catholics think that voluntary afflictions "undertaken from the love of God and faith working by love "appease the *wrath* of God *(placare iram Dei*[q])." Tournely says, "that God after the pardon of sin still exacts a *revenging* "temporal punishment from the penitent, (*ultricem pœnam* "*temporalem a pœnitente adhuc reposcere*[r])." Your own expressions are equally strong. In arguing for the necessity of Satisfaction you say, "Even so, when God remits a weight of "eternal punishment, it seems but fair that the outrage done to "his divine Majesty should be repaired by outward acts, ex- "pressive of sorrow, and directed to *appease his wrath*, and *avert* "*those scourges which he still reserves in his hand*." You afterwards state your belief "that the sinner may, by punishing "himself, by performing certain works propitiatory before God, "avert his *anger*." (Lectures, ii. 48, 51.) And these, Sir, are not mere incautious expressions; they are the natural and necessary result of your doctrine, that remitted sins are still liable to the demands of Divine justice. For the Scripture teaches us, that *sin* is the object of God's wrath and vengeance, and if any sin be still subject to the demands of his justice, it is equally subject to those of his wrath and vengeance. So that, according to your doctrine, the justified and pardoned believer is still liable to God's wrath! The adopted, beloved, and sanctified child, is still subject to God's vengeance! God loves and hates, saves and destroys, at the same moment; and the same beings are at once reckoned with the elect and the reprobate, with angels and with devils! Can it be possible for absurdity, contradiction, and impiety to go beyond this? And yet this is the necessary, the inevitable consequence to which your doctrine leads.

Such, Sir, is your doctrine of temporal penalties for remitted sins—a doctrine unsupported by reason and experience, rejected by Scripture, contradictory to itself, and subversive of the Christian's hope of salvation. And yet it is on this doctrine that your whole body of doctrine concerning Satisfactions, Purgatory, and Indulgences vitally depend. Doubt that temporal penalties are by any Divine law now inflicted on sin repented of, and what need can there be for all the Satisfactions prescribed

q Walenburch, Opera, t. iii. p. 19.
r Tournely, De Pœnit. t. ii. p. 3.

by you for the remission of temporal penalties? What necessity is there for Purgatory to complete those penalties not discharged in this life? What need for Indulgences to remit them? What need for Suffrages and Masses for the dead, to relieve souls from the fiery torments of Purgatory? These questions I leave for the present to your consideration, and beg to subscribe myself,

Your obedient Servant,

WILLIAM PALMER.

Oxford, April, 24, 1841.

A

THIRD LETTER

TO

N. WISEMAN, D. D.

ON THE

ROMISH DOCTRINE

OF

SATISFACTIONS.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M. A.

OF WORCESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

A THIRD LETTER, &c.

Sir,

In my last Letter I demonstrated, that according to the doctrines generally taught in the Church of Rome, a justified and sanctified person still remains subject to the *wrath* of God; that a beloved child of God has to dread His *anger* and His *vengeance;* that the same persons are at the same moment *loved* and *hated* by their Creator and Saviour. These conclusions are intimately and indissolubly connected with your belief, that temporal *punishments* remain to be endured after sin has been pardoned. They lie at the foundation of your doctrine of Satisfaction, Purgatory, and Indulgences. It is my intention to pursue this error into all its ramifications, and to expose the mass of dangerous errors and superstitions, and of absurd contradictions to which it leads, and in which it actually involves all your theologians.

On the present occasion, your doctrine of Satisfaction shall become the subject of discussion; and with this view we must in the first instance proceed to ascertain what your tenets really are on this point, and to what practices they give rise.

1. It is your belief then, that after sin has been remitted as far as regards its guilt and eternal penalties, by the merits of Christ's sacrifice applied in the sacrament of Penance, a temporal penalty still remains due to the justice of an offended and angry God; and that this wrath and anger of avenging justice may be *appeased*, and your sin *expiated* and *atoned for* as regards its temporal penalty, by Satisfactions, that is, penitential works, such as prayer, alms giving, fasting, mortifications, &c.

2. You also believe, that Indulgences *validly* and *effectually* received, remit a portion or the whole of the temporal penalty due to remitted sin, and partially or wholly remove the necessity for satisfactions; but as it is impossible, generally speaking, to know whether the *conditions* on which alone Indulgences are valid, have been fulfilled in any particular case, you therefore hold that penitents ought to *continue* in the performance of works of satisfaction to the *end of their lives*, and never believe themselves relieved from the necessity of expiating and atoning for sin, although that sin may have been re-

mitted and pardoned long before in the sacrament of Penance.

Such is your belief on this point, as I shall now shew by references to your own writings, and to those of other eminent theologians of the Roman Communion.

I. With reference then to the first point, you say,

"1. That God, after the remission of sin, retains a lesser "chastisement in his power, to be inflicted on the sinner. 2. "That penitential works [i. e. satisfactions], fasting, alms "deeds, contrite weeping, and fervent prayer, have the power "of averting that punishment. 3. That this scheme of God's "*justice* was not a part of the imperfect law, but the unvary- "ing ordinance of his dispensation, anterior to the Mosaic ritual, "and amply confirmed by Christ in the Gospel. 4. That it "consequently becomes a part of all true repentance to try to "*satisfy* this *divine justice*, by the voluntary assumption of "such penitential works, as his revealed truth assures us have "efficacy before Him. These propositions contain the *Catholic* "*doctrine* concerning Satisfaction[a]." Again: "When God "remits a weight of eternal punishment, it seems but fair that "the outrage done to his Divine Majesty should be repaired by "outward acts, expressive of sorrow, and directed to *appease* "*his wrath*, and avert those *scourges* which he still reserves in "his hand. Hence in the sacrament of Penance, that third "part which we call *satisfaction*[b]." Your doctrine is afterwards described to be, "that sin is forgiven, but *punishment* "still inflicted; that God will chastise in his justice, but that "the sinner may, by punishing himself, by performing certain "works propitiatory before God, *avert his anger*, and obtain "remission of this lesser chastisement[c]."

Tournely lays down the following formal proposition.

"*Penal satisfaction* is necessarily to be exacted of penitents, "not merely to preserve them in newness of life, to heal their "infirmity, and to afford an example to others, as the Innova- "tors imagine; but also in order to punish and chastise past "sins, or to make real satisfaction, not only to the Church but "to God; as well to repair the injury done to Him by sin, as "to *redeem* the *temporal punishment*, which after the guilt and "eternal punishment has been forgiven, remains to be dis- "charged by us, either in this life, or another[d]."

Thus then it is plain, as I have said, that you believe satisfactory or penitential works necessary for the remission of the temporal penalty exacted by the justice of a wrathful and angry

[a] Wiseman's Lectures on the Doctrines, &c. of the Catholic Church, vol. ii. p. 47.
[b] Ibid. p. 48. [c] Ibid. p. 51. [d] Tournely, De Pœnit. t. ii. p. 4.

God, *after* the guilt and eternal punishment of sin have been remitted, and after the penitent has been placed in a state of grace.

II. I now proceed to the second point—the necessity of continual penance, or of works of satisfaction during the remainder of life.

"We can never be certain," says Bouvier bishop of Mans, "that we have obtained by many (even most plenary) indulgences, the complete remission of all the temporal punishment due to our sins; for a plenary indulgence often becomes partial [i. e. remits only a *part* of the temporal punishment] either through want of a sufficient cause, or through want of a work proportioned to the end designed, or through defect of dispositions in the agent Hence, first, an indulgence does not exempt from the obligation of doing penance [by satisfactions]; and à fortiori, a believer cannot, of his own authority, omit a sacramental penance [satisfaction] *enjoined* to him, under pretext that he has gained or is about to gain an indulgence[e]." "Indulgences of a hundred years or more, if there are such, may be insufficient to compensate the whole temporal punishment which a sinner is bound to pay . . . Hence, thirdly, sinners truly converted ought to endeavour daily by *good works* [satisfactions] and indulgences, whether partial or plenary, to diminish the debts which they owe to Divine *justice*, and to *compensate* for them entirely in this life, lest they be sent to the prisons of purgatory, and do not come out thence till they have paid the last farthing[f]." Dr. Milner, one of your nominal bishops, says, "We do not believe an indulgence to imply any exemption from repentance . . . nor from the *works of penance*, or other good works, because our Church teaches, that 'the life of a Christian ought to be a *perpetual penance*.'" "(Concil. Trid. de Extr. Unct.) 'No one can ever be sure that he has gained the entire benefit of an indulgence, though he has performed all the conditions appointed for this creed.'"

Thus[g] it appears that even Indulgences and the execution of the works of satisfaction enjoined by your priests in confession, do not render you secure that sin has been remitted; and hence you recommend in addition, *voluntary works of satisfaction*, over and above those prescribed by the priest. To these the Council of Trent alludes in the expressions above cited by Dr. Milner; and the Catechism of the Council speaks thus of them,

[e] Bouvier, De Pœnit. p. 300.
[f] Bouvier, ibid p 301; See also Tournely, De Pœnit. t. ii. p. 299.
[g] Milner, End of Controversy, Lett. xlii.

"Under the same name [*satisfaction*] is signified also any sort "of punishment which we endure for our sins, not imposed by "the priest, but undertaken of our own accord, and repeated "by ourselves. This does not by any means belong to Peni- "tence as a sacrament[h]." The use and necessity of such voluntary penances is thus stated in Dr. James Butler's Catechism sanctioned by the authorities of your schism in Ireland: "Q. "Will the penance enjoined in confession always satisfy for "our sins? A. No; but whatever else is wanting may be sup- "plied by Indulgences, *and our own penitential endeavours*[i]."

And well indeed may you advise your penitents not to remain satisfied with the satisfactions or penances which are imposed on them at Confession, when it is remembered, that according to your most approved writers, the amount of penance assigned in the Confessional is to be measured by *the wishes of the penitent;* that it is considered better to impose so slight a penance as the repetition of a *single Pater Noster*, or even *no penance at all*, rather then send the penitent away unabsolved[k];

[h] Eodem verò nomine quodlibet etiam pœnæ genus significatur, quam pro peccatis non quidem à sacerdote constitutam, sed sponte nostra susceptam, atque à nobis ipsis repetitam, sustinemus. *Nota.* Verùm hæc ad pœnitentiam, ut sacramentum est, minimè pertinet. Cat. Conc. Trid. Pars ii. de pœnit. c. 88.

[i] "The most Rev. Dr. James Butler's Catechism, &c. approved "and recommended by the four R. C. Archbishops of Ireland as a "general Catechism for the kingdom." Eleventh Edition, Coyne, Dublin.

[k] "Rituale Parisiense dicit, 'Confessarius pœnitentem interroget, "an possit pœnitentiam sibi injunctam peragere, alioquin eam pro "sua prudentia immutet, aut minuat.' . . . unde *Gerson* in *regula "mor. p.* 2. c. *de pœnitentia*, dicit: 'Tutius est cum parva pœnitentia, "quæ sponte suscipitur, et verosimiliter adimpletur, ducere confes- "sos ad purgatorium, quam cum magna non implenda præcipitare "in infernum.' . . . item *Scotus d* 15 *q.* 1. *art* 5. loquens de pœni- "tente qui animo est infirmus, ait, 'Si adeo est delicatus, quod non "velit jejunium adimplere, imo si nullam pœnitentiam vult reci- "pere, absolvendus est, et non respuendus, ne cadet in desperatio- "nem,' et sic demum concludit: 'Illud sibi imponendum quod "libentius recipit, et quod creditur impleturus' . . . Additque idem "S. archiepiscopus *(S. Carolus Borromæus)* 'Talem imponat pœni- "tentiam, qualem a pœnitente præ-tari posse judicet. Proinde "aliquando, si ita expedire viderit, illum interroget, an possit, anve "dubitet pœnitentiam sibi injunctam peragere; alioquin eam mu- "tabit aut minuet . . . . . 'Itaque (ut inquit *Host.)* confessor nullo "modo debet permittere peccatorem desperatum recedere a se, sed "potius imponat ei unum *Pater noster* vel aliud leve, et quod alia "bona quæ fecerit, et mala quæ toleraverit, sint ei in pœnitentia, "concordante S. Thoma' &c." Beati A. M. de Ligorio, Theologia Molaris, t vi. p. 125—128. Ed. Vesontio, 1831; see also Bouvier, de Pœnit. p. 147.

and that the penance, if inconvenient, may be *commuted* for another[1]. This system of course makes the imposition of Satisfaction at Confession a mere mockery; although that Satisfaction is, all the time, loudly asserted to be a part of the sacrament of Penance; so that we need not wonder to find you recommending penitents not to put their whole confidence in such sacramental Satisfactions.

From all this then it is evident, that you are not certain that the temporal penalty due to divine justice for sin remitted, is removed by the performance of the satisfaction enjoined in Confession, or by the subsequent acquisition of Indulgences. No: you will urge the penitent to undertake voluntary works of penance; and as no human wisdom can determine what amount of such acts may be sufficient to satisfy the demands of Divine Justice, it follows that, according to the doctrine of the Council of Trent, "the life of a Christian ought to be a *perpetual penance*."

But, Sir, painful as such a thought must be, and dispiriting to Christians, your doctrine goes much further than this, if it be examined. For what do you mean, when you say that a person owes a debt to Divine *justice*, and is bound to satisfy for the temporal punishment due to his remitted sin? You mean, that *he is still subject to the wrath and vengeance of an offended God*. What is your own language, when describing the object of satisfactions, or penitential works? "When God remits "a weight of eternal punishment, it seems but fair, that the "*outrage* done to his Divine Majesty should be *repaired* by "outward acts, expressive of sorrow, and directed to *appease* "*his wrath*, and avert those *scourges* which he still reserves in "his hand." (Lectures, ii. 48.) You believe, as you say, "that the sinner may, by punishing himself, by performing "certain works propitiatory before God, *avert his anger*, and "obtain a remission even of this lesser chastisement." (Lectures, ii. 51.) Tournely, again, speaks of the temporal punishment due to remitted sin, as "a revenging punishment," (De Pœn. ii. 4); and the language of all your writers is just the same. You all maintain, that Satisfactions are intended to appease the "wrath," to mitigate the "anger," to avert the "punishments" and "vengeance" of an offended God. Such is the view which you take of God *after he has pardoned your sins*. You believe that notwithstanding that pardon, his wrath burns against you, and is so fierce, that if you are not sufficiently tormented in this life, you must go into Purgatory and

[1] Ligorio, Theol. Mor. t. vi. p. 144; Bouvier. p. 158.

suffer the torments of HELL! Yes: you believe that God consigns those whom he has justified and sanctified, those whom he loves with a Father's love, those whom he has endowed with the rich and glorious gifts of faith, hope, and charity, those who are themselves full of filial love and affection to Him —to the torments of Hell! "*The constant doctrine of the "Latines,*" says Bouvier, bishop of Mans, "is, that in Purga- "tory there is a *material fire like the infernal fire,* and there- "fore that the Church, in praying for the souls of the faithful, "asks not only for a place of light and peace, but also of cool- "ing (refrigerii); that is to say, against the ardour of the fire[m]."

Bellarmine teaches the same doctrine in the following terms. "As Cardinal Cajetan rightly explains, the punishment which "remains to be expiated after the remission of guilt is that very "same *sensible* punishment which the sinner ought to have "suffered in Hell; its eternity only being removed[n]."

This, Sir, is the view which you uniformly take of the disposition of God towards penitent and pardoned sinners: you teach them still to tremble under the apprehension of his wrath. And when is this fear to be removed? when is the sinner to be at peace with God? when is he to look with joy and love to God as a reconciled and loving Father? NEVER IN THIS LIFE. You tell him that Absolution cannot appease the anger of God —that sacramental satisfaction cannot do it—that Indulgences even are uncertain—that he must spend *the remainder of his life* in works of voluntary penance—and at last, that he may and probably will go into the torments of HELL for a time. He is then to spend his whole life under the apprehension that he is still subject to God's wrath and vengeance, and still liable to the demands of his justice.

And is this the *peace* and *consolation* which you offer to burdened consciences? Are these the blessings which are to flow on those who go to you to heal their wounds, and soothe their afflictions? Let me contrast with this dark and melancholy system, the consoling and joyful words of encouragement offered to penitents by Jesus Christ. "Come unto me, all ye that la- "bour and are heavy laden, and *I will give you rest.* Take my

[m] Constans Latinorum sententia est in purgatorio esse ignem materialem similem igni infernali, et ideo Ecclesiam pro animabus fidelium orantem, non petere tantùm locum lucis et pacis, sed et refrigerii, videlicet contra ignis ardorem. Bouvier, De Pœnit p. 285.

[n] Nam (ut rectè explicat Card. Cajetan. in tract. de contritione, quæst. 4.) pœna illa quæ luenda restat post culpæ remissionem, est illa ipsa pœna sensus, quam in Gehenna pati debuisset peccator, remota solum æternitate. Bellarmin. De Pœnitentia, lib. iv. c. i.

"yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in "heart: and ye shall find *rest unto your souls*. For my *yoke* "*is easy, and my burden is light*." (Matt. xi 28—30.) Does your system afford *rest to souls?* Is your yoke *easy*, and your burden *light?* I put this question solemnly to your conscience, Whether a system so inconsistent with that of Jesus Christ can be true? You give no "rest" to the souls of penitents, when you tell them that they are still subject to the *wrath* of an offended God. You impose on them no "easy yoke," no "light burden," in enjoining laborious works of satisfaction during life, under an uncertain hope that they may deliver them from the excruciating tortures of Purgatory. Can your doctrine then be true? Can it be the doctrine of Jesus Christ?

Let me again draw your attention to the words of St. Paul in describing the state of justification. "Therefore being justi- "fied by faith, we have PEACE WITH GOD, through our Lord "Jesus Christ. By whom also we have access by faith into "this grace wherein we stand, and REJOICE in hope of the "glory of God And not only so, but we *glory in tribu-* "*lations also:* knowing that tribulation worketh patience; "and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope "maketh not ashamed; because THE LOVE OF GOD is shed "abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given "unto us. For when we were yet without strength, in due "time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righte- "ous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some "would even dare to die. But God commendeth HIS LOVE "towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died "for us. Much more then, *being now justified by his blood,* "*we shall be* SAVED FROM WRATH *through him.* For if, when "we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of "his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by "his life. And not only so, but we also JOY in God through "our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the "atonement." (Rom. v. 1—11.)

Would to God that these words of the Apostle might sink down into the heart of every one of our separated brethren of the Romish pursuasion! It would almost seem as if the Apostle had written them, under the direction of the Holy Ghost, for the very purpose of refuting the errors against which I am contending. What is your view of the condition of the justified? You believe that, after their sins are pardoned, they still remain subject to the *wrath* and *vengeance* of God. Is this to have "*peace with God?*" You believe that they are to look forward to painful afflictions from God's *anger* in this world or

the next; to "*the scourges*" of his wrath; to the tortures of his *revenge* in purgatory. Is this to "*rejoice* in hope of the "glory of God?" You look with fear and terror on temporal afflictions, believing them to be punishments for your sins. Is this to "*glory in tribulations* also?" You look on God as an angry and vindictive judge, exacting payment to the last farthing, either in this world or in purgatory. Is this to have "*the love of God shed abroad in your hearts* by the Holy "Ghost?" You think that after you have been justified by the blood of Christ applied in the sacrament of Penance, you are still subject to "the wrath" of God. Is this to believe that "being now *justified* by Christ's blood, "we shall BE SAVED "FROM WRATH through him?" Let this one passage of Scripture be fully and calmly considered, and compared with your doctrines; and there can be no doubt of the result.

I would again solicit your attention to the words of the Apostle John. "There is no fear in love; but *perfect love casteth* "*out fear; because fear hath torment.* He that feareth is not "made perfect in love. We love Him because He first loved "us." (1 John iv. 18, 19.) The Apostle does not mean to forbid that godly fear of future transgressions, which is necessary to preserve a Christian from sin; but he does most certainly assert, that the perfect love of God casts out all slavish fear, all dread of God's *wrath* and *vengeance* for remitted sin, all uneasiness, misery, anxiety under a sense of the Divine *anger*. In this sense "perfect love casteth out fear, bucause fear hath torment." The man who trembles under a sense of God's wrath, cannot perfectly love him; and thus, Sir, your doctrine renders it impossible for those who receive it to love their Creator "per-"fectly."

How melancholy is it to see professing Christians so blind to the real character of God! Listen to the Apostle John; "GOD "IS LOVE. In this was manifested THE LOVE of God toward "us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the "world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not "that we loved God, but that HE LOVED US, and sent his Son "to be the propitiation for our sins" (1 John iv. 8—10.) We have the testimony of our Lord himself to the same consolatory truth: "God so LOVED the world, that he gave his only-"begotten Son." (John iii. 16.) "At that day ye shall ask "in my name; and I say not unto you, that I will pray the "Father for you; for THE FATHER HIMSELF LOVETH you, "because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out "from God." (John xvi. 26, 27) This most blessed truth is written in evey page of the Gospel. What but the most exceeding

and infinite *love* and *mercy* could have induced the Father to consign his only-begotton Son to the death of the Cross, for those who were alienated from him, and dead in trespasses and sins? What but love and mercy could have devised such an awful sacrifice to bring back sinners into the way of salvation,—a salvation which no human merits could ever have obtained? It is this love and mercy which induces the Lord to bear with the sins and offences of his creatures, and which alone leads them to repentance. "Despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long suffering, not knowing that the *goodness of God* leadeth thee to repentance?" (Rom. ii. 4) And is it this good, this merciful, this loving Being, whom you regard as a God of wrath and vengeance towards the objects of his love? What deep ingratitude is this? what an injury to that ETERNAL LOVE, which regards the justified and sanctified members of Christ with an affection beyond all human imagination!

In what light does our Saviour represent God in his dealings with repentant sinners? He describes him as a FATHER rejoicing to receive an ungrateful and prodigal son: "When he was yet a great way off, his father saw him, and *had compassion on him*, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against Heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son. But the father said to his servants, Bring forth the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet; and bring hither the fatted calf, and kill it; and let us eat, and be merry: for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found." (Luke xv. 20—24.) Can any images more forcibly express the love of God towards repentant sinners? Here is no "wrath"—no "vengeance"—no "anger"—but all is joy, and exultation. Here is no "*reserve* of punishment"—no *partial forgiveness*—no exceptions out of the general amnesty—no store of bitter and infernal "tortures" to be rigidly exacted even to the last farthing." And yet this is the point of view in which our Lord wishes us to regard the dispositions and dealings of God with real penitents. Do not say to me, that the contrition of the prodigal son was so *intense*, that it remitted all temporal punishment; but that *his* constitutes a peculiar case, and ought not to lead penitents generally to expect an equal degree of Divine love and mercy. For if we examine this case, there was nothing to take it out of the ordinary rules. The prodigal son was reduced to distress by his own vices; "and when he came to himself," he resolved to arise and go to his father We do not read of any signs of *extreme* contrition or anguish of soul.

We read of no tears, no fastings, no sackcloth, no mortifications; but he merely "arose and came to his father." This then is the description of every one who is really penitent, and the conduct of God here described is sufficient to shew the error and unsoundness of your doctrine.

I will not weary the reader by accumulating additional proofs from Scripture of what is so plain and evident; but shall proceed next to consider the BURDENS which your doctrine of Satisfactions imposes on Christians—burdens wholly useless and ineffective for the end for which they are imposed—the expiation of remitted sin.

Be it remembered then, that according to your doctrine, penal works of Satisfaction are due to the justice of an angry God, after sin has been pardoned; and that such works must be continued through life, notwithstanding the performance of the works of Satisfaction assigned in confession, and notwithstanding the execution of all works necessary to gain Indulgences. Now let us consider what these Satisfactions are, which you thus recommend your people to continue through life.

Amongst other penal Satsfactions for sin, the following are mentioned by Amort.[o] Concealing one's self for a time in some Monastery or other secluded place, and living in penitence there. Abstaining from meat and wine. Fasting on certain days, especially on Wednesday, Friday, Saturday, or feeding only on bread and water. Praying with bended knees, or with the arms extended in the figure of the Cross for a certain time, and at an appointed hour, before the Cross, or some other sacred image in the church. Lying on the ground for some time, or on a hard couch. *Applying the scourge* to one's self on certain days. Putting on *sackcloth*. Undertaking some religious pilgrimage. Reciting the penitential psalms and other penitential prayers. Visiting certain churches where there are stations, or some other great devotion. Weekly fastings during life. Monthly confessions. Prayers every hour or half hour. The office of the Rosary on Sundays and Holy days

Amongst penances mentioned by Alphonsus Liguori are, entering a Monastic order. Acts of grief every evening, "to *visit* "every day the holy Sacrament, and *also the image of St. Mary*, "beseeching from *them* (!) the grace of perseverance; to recite "at least the third part of the Rosary, and the Angelical saluta- "tion three times, every morning and evening, saying, 'My

[o] Eusebii Amort, Theologia Eclectica Moralis et Scholastica sub auspiciis SS. D. N. Benedicti xiv, &c. t. xiv. p. 405. Ed. August. Vind. 1752

"mother assist me to-day, that I sin not against God;' which "penance," says Liguori, "of thrice reciting the Angelical sal- "utation with the aforesaid supplication, it was my custom gen- "erally to enjoin, or at least to recommend to those who did not "use them." Another penitential work is, "unremitting reci- "tation of the Angelical salutation in honour of the purity of "the most blessed Virgin, morning and evening, repeating "always before *her image* the resolution not to commit sin."[p] Another is, "to make the sign of the cross nine or five times "*on the ground with the tongue*[q]." Other penances may be assigned at the particular desire of the penitent, though at first with moderation: "It will be enough to allow them at the "beginning some small mortification, but seldom; such as "*scourging*, an *iron chain*, abstinence, rather to inspire a wish "for mortifications, than to mortify them as is fitting; and "afterwards he [the Confessor] may deal *more liberally*."[r] Liguori adds, that ordinary works of Christian piety may be openly performed, such as "frequenting the Sacraments, mental "prayer, visitation of the Sacrament, hearing mass with bended "knees and recollection of spirit," &c. "But works of "extraordinary supererogation, and which savour of singular- "ity, such as the above-mentioned external penances of *sack- "cloth, scourges, prayer with expanded arms, eating bitter "herbs*, sighings, weeping at time of prayer, ought to be con- "concealed as far as possible[s]."

Bouvier Bishop of Mans, in his Treatise on Penance, recommends the following penances. Fasting on bread and water; abstinence from meat, wine, and fermented liquors; flagellations and sackcloth; holy pilgrimages, especially those made on foot; watchings at night, and lying on the ground or on a hard bed; genuflexions; extensions of the arms; or other painful postures of the body; abstinence from pleasures, entertainments, games, hunting, riding, rich dress, &c; pecuniary payments; recita-

[p] Ligorio, Theologia Moralis, t. ix. p. 14.

[q] "Illi, qui solitus fuit blasphemias proferre, insinuatur ut novies vel quinquies lingua signet crucem super terram." Ib. p. 15.

[r] Satis erit ab initio eis concedere aliquam tenuem sed raram mortificationem, ut disciplinam, catenulam ferream, abstinentiam, potius ad ingerendum in eorum animis mortificationis desiderium, quam ad eos ut convenit mortificandos. Ligorio, Theol. Mor. t. ix. p. 123. (Praxis Confessarii, n. 146.)

[s] Opera autem quæ sapiunt singularitatem, ut supra enarratæ pœnitentiæ externæ ciliciorum, flagellorum, orationis cum brachiis in crucem expansis, comestionis herbarum amariorum, suspiriorum, fletus tempore orationis, &c. occultari debent quantum possibile est. Ibid. p. 124. (n. 147.)

tion of the psalms, Rosary, &c.; meditation and mental prayer; a certain number of repetitions of forms, called Acts of Faith, Hope, Charity, Humility, Contrition, &c.; visitation of Churches; adoration of the holy Sacrament; exercises of religion; acts of piety towards our Lord, or towards the blessed Virgin, or towards the Saints[t].

Morinus mentions the following penances. Walking with bare feet, or without shoes; wearing painful garments; using no carriage or horse; scourging or discipline; repetition of psalters; wearing iron hoops round the body; imprisonment; genuflexions; prostrations on the ground; alms-giving; voluntary exile; entering a monastery, &c. &c.[u] According to Trevern, Bishop of Strasburg; "true penitents, whether under the Law "or the Gospel, taking in hand the interests of Heaven, have "taken vengeance on themselves, by voluntary punishments, "for the sins they have committed . . . witness those innumer- "able penitents in all ages, who have peopled deserts and mon- "asteries, and lived there in privations, and austerities, to *ex- "piate faults pardoned long before*[x]." So that, according to your view, the mortifications of the Saints in all ages are to be regarded as so many *penances* voluntarily imposed for the expiation of their sins. These are the models which are held up for the instruction of those who wish to obtain remission of the temporal penalties supposed to be due to their remitted sins. And what then are the penances which such examples teach you to inflict on yourselves?

I shall not bring my readers to the Lives of the Saints contained in your Breviary, and point out the penances there held up to the admiration and imitation of the faithful; such as, Continued abstinence from food for many weeks; fasting on bread and water; living for years in holes excavated in the rocks; the use of lacerating bandages, and iron chains continually worn round the body; immersions in freezing water; the application of nettles and scourges; rolling one's self among thorns; the use of belts set with needles; of hair shirts; of iron crowns filled with points inside; of beds made of rough trunks of trees, and the interstices filled up with pottery. No, these, and many other self inflicted torments for the expiation of sin *already pardoned*, are well known to all who have investigated this subject, and I therefore need not dwell on them here at any length.

[t] Bouvier, De Pœnitentia, p. 150. (De operibus injungendis.)
[u] Morinus, Tract. de Pœnitentia, lib. vii. c. 13, 14, 15.
[x] Trevern, Discussion Amicale, tom. ii. p. 206.

But, Sir, I have to produce evidence as to the penances recommended or allowed amongst you at the present day, from a work to which I have already referred, and which will have additional weight as being known to proceed from your own pen: I mean, "The Lives of St. Alphonsus Liguori, &c."[y]—a work published only *two years ago*, immediately after the Canonization of the distinguished individuals whose lives it contains. Suffer me then to make some extracts from this very authentic work, in illustration of the system which prevails, and of the species of penances which are authorized, in the Church of Rome.

St. Alphonsus Liguori.—His mode of life with the Society he instituted was as follows. "Their house was small "and inconvenient, their beds a mere sack of straw resting on "the floor; and their only food, in general, was a dish of soup, "which was both insipid and disagreeable, with a small quan- "tity of fruit. The bread was black and not even leavened, "through the inexperience of the lay-brother who made it, and "so hard that it was necessary to pound it in a mortar before "they could eat it. This miserable food, which they ate "kneeling or stretched upon the ground, they rendered still "more nauseous, by sprinkling it over with some bitter stuff, "and many of them, before eating, licked the floor with "their tongue. They disciplined themselves three times in "each week." (p. 15.) "He surpassed all his companions in "the exactness with which he observed all the rules and obliga- "tions of the order; but seeing the severity with which he dis- "ciplined himself, and the austerity of his fasts and mortifica- "tions, it was a source of wonder how he could live. He was "content with a small quantity of soup and bread with some "fruit, although he never touched the latter upon Saturday, "and the Vigils of our Lady. He wore continually rough "hair-shirts, with small iron chains and a girdle of camel's "hair." (p. 20.)

"Every morning and evening, the missionaries preached to "the adults and catechised the children. For the first three "evenings, they went round the most populous streets with a "crucifix, calling upon the inhabitants to remember the last "things, and to come to hear the words of God. Alphonsus, "who delivered the principal sermon in the evening, was ac- "customed to discipline himself with a thick rope three times

[y] The Lives of St. Alphonsus Liguori, St. Francis de Girolamo, St. John Joseph of the Cross, St. Pacificus of San Severino, and St. Veronica Giuliani, whose canonization took place on Trinity Sunday, 26th of May, 1839. London, 1839.

"during the mission; once *during the sermon* upon sin; a se-
"cond time during that upon hell; and a third during that
"upon scandal; and when the women had left the church,
"after the evening sermon, and the men alone remained, a ser-
"mon upon compunction was addressed to them, *to excite*
"*them to discipline themselves*." (p. 24.) "His food was of
"the most inferior kind, and even this he sprinkled with worm-
"wood and other bitter herbs, so that the poor, who flocked to
"him, refused to eat of what he had left of it. His attendants
"were few in number, and he treated them on every occasion
"with the greatest kindness and sweetness. His mortifications
"seemed to increase both in severity and frequency, and one
"day his secretary had to burst open his door, and snatch the
"discipline out of his hands, fearing lest the violence where-
"with he scourged himself might cause his death." (p. 31.)

St. Francis di Girolamo. "When the Sunday came,
"he first spent two hours in mental prayer, after which he
"scourged himself long and severely with the discipline (a
"practice he observed daily at the hour of rising), then said
"mass." (p. 72.) "After the discourse on his knees at the
"foot of the Cross, he scourged his shoulders with the disci-
"pline, and then once more betook himself to the Confessional."
(p. 73.) "A youth of disordered life was so moved by another
"sermon of Francis, that in public, overcoming every human
"respect, he cast himself at the foot of the crucifix, exclaiming,
"'Father, I am lost; for nearly twenty years I have not been
"a confessor,' and so saying, wept bitterly, and lashed him-
"self with the discipline." (p. 93.)

St. John Joseph of the Cross. "He early manifested
"his attachment to the Cross, sleeping upon a narrow hard bed,
"and fasting on appointed days during the week; and as he
"mortified the flesh betimes, so also he checked all pride, by
"constantly wearing mean clothes." (p. 121.) "Once he had
"to perform a journey of considerable distance, and set out with
"alacrity, although his limbs were afflicted with grievous ul-
"cers. . . . He had not gone far, when, slipping on the ice, he
"fell, and cruelly lacerated his wounded limbs, so that he
"could hardly stand upright; still with heroic fortitude and
"perseverance, he prosecuted and accomplished his task. . . . . .
"A rough seat and a table, a bed consisting of two narrow
"planks, with two sheep-skins and a wretched woollen cover-
"let, a stool to rest his wounded legs upon—these, with his
"breviary, formed the whole furniture of his cell." (p. 143.)

"We come now to speak of his extraordinary mortifications.
"To the numerous *penitential austerities* enjoined by his order.

"ne added as many more as an ingenious self-denial could de-
"vise. He guarded his senses most particularly; even in his
"youth he would not permit himself the liberty of lifting his
"eyes to the roof of his cell; and when he was a priest, he
"made it a rule to look no one whomsoever in the face. His
"ears he mortified by denying them the gratification of music.
"He would not even smell a flower. Silent as long as possi-
"ble, when he spoke, it was in a low voice. Bareheaded in
"all seasons, he wore under his rough and heavy habit divers
"hair-shirts and chains, which he was careful to vary to keep
"the sense of torment ever fresh. Besides, he used the dis-
"cipline to a severe degree; and when at the age of forty, his
"superior obliged him to wear sandals, he placed between them
"and his feet a quantity of small nails; but the most tremend-
"ous instrument of torture which he devised against himself.
"was a cross about a foot in length, set with rows of sharp
"nails, which he fastened tight over his shoulders, so as to
"open there a wound which never after closed. Another simi-
"lar but smaller cross he wore attached to his breast. But his
"abridgment of sleep was truly wonderful, and he never took
"it, save seated on the ground, or cramped up in his little bed,
"often with his head leaning against a piece of wood jutting
"from the wall. No less singular was his abstinence. For
"the last thirty years of his life, he entirely overcame that
"most insatiable of wants, thirst, absolutely abstaining not
"merely from wine and water, but from every liquid whatso-
"ever."(p. 147, 148.)

St. Pacificus of San Severino. "As about the middle
"of his life he became deaf, his brethren heard the prayers
"which he uttered almost without interruption, for he took
"only three or four hours of sleep on a bed, so rough and un-
"comfortable, that it seemed made for mortification and tor-
"ment, rather than ease and repose. Upon the vigils preced-
"ing the festivals of the Church, especially those dedicated to
"our blessed Lady, he fasted on water and a small piece of
"bread, which he had kept for the week before exposed to the
"scorching heat of the sun. He went almost barefoot and
"without any covering on his legs, although the ulcers before
"mentioned inspired compassion and horror in all who chanced
"to see them." (p. 181.) "Pacificus felt a particular devotion
"towards his good angel, the chaste spouse of Mary, St. Joseph,
"and St. Francis of Asisium, whose custom of keeping *seven*
"*lents* during the year he faithfully followed, even in his old
"age, until his superiors commanded him to abandon it." (p.
188.) "Trusting in the certainty of divine retribution, he sub-

"jected his body to rigorous fasts, and severe disciplines, to "take which, besides the three times each week prescribed by "the rule, he was often watched retiring to the belfry, or some "other secret place, that he might not be seen by men." (p. 191.)

"He used every artifice to hide his mortifications and cruel "disciplines from others, and anxiously sought to conceal the "supernatural powers which God had imparted to him. Who "can say with what severe mortifications and fasts he subdued "his body? Besides fasting, as we have seen, three times in "the week, until his superiors restricted him to Friday and "Saturday, whereon he sometimes did not even taste a morsel "of bread or a drop of water, and the Lents of St. Francis, he "made the little that he did eat a means of additional mortifi-"cation, by *mixing his food with ashes*, as was attested by many "who observed him attentively. And another more remark-"able example will confirm what we have just said. On occa-"sion of the pardon of Asisium, a fair used in his time to be held "in a square, near the convent of Forano, Pacificus passing "through it, and smelling the flesh of roasted pork, said sev-"eral times to his companion, 'Do you perceive this smell?' "The other, supposing that he had a desire of tasting some of "the flesh, told the superior, who immediately ordered a piece "of it to be brought and placed before him at table. He did "not touch it, but requested the brother who served at table to "gratify him by placing it before him until he should have "eaten it. His request was complied with, and each day it "was brought to table, until at last, when it was putrid he eat "it, saying to himself, 'Eat vile body; it is not pork now as "it was at first.'" (p. 207, 208.)

"Besides the regular disciplines prescribed by rule three "times in the week, he cruelly scourged himself thrice each "day, with chains or cords, so as to fill all with horror, who "heard the whistling of the lash, or saw the abundance of "blood which he shed during the flagellation. Covered with "hair-shirts, he undertook long journeys over thorns and sharp "stones, slept little, never approached the fire, and kept the "window and door of his cell open, in the most rigorous "winters, in order to hear the bell summoning him to the "duties of the community." (p. 208.) "Not being aware, "through his defect in sight and hearing, of the presence of "any one in his room, he rose from his bed, and placing him-"self devoutly on his knees, recited three *Ave Marias*, saying "at the end, with singular earnestness, 'Let these be, O my "God, *in satisfaction for my sins*.' He would have prayed

"much longer, but his illness prevented him; and as it became "every moment more and more violent, the holy Sacrament of "Extreme Unction was administered." (p. 217.)

St. Veronica Giuliani. "When she was about three "years old, she heard an account of the sufferings of the saints, "and especially of the martyrs,—when she instantly ran and "placed her hands in a fire, whence she did not draw them out "until the whole family had been brought by the smell into the "room." (p. 226.) "A desire," she said, "came into my "head of asking my confessor for some mortification, but I did "not yield to it. Still I made sufferings for myself, but all "without my confessor's leave; such as the discipline, walking "on my bare knees, pricking myself with a pin, kissing some "filthy spot, and beating myself with thistles. If I heard of "the works of penance performed by others, I went to the image "of my Saviour, and said, 'Lord, if I had their instruments of "mortification, I would do the same; but since I have them not, "I offer thee my desire.' He has often let me know and re-"member that he made me (at that age) affectionate invita-"tions." (p. 227, 228.) "One of the commands given to "Veronica after her espousals [with our Saviour!], was, that "she should encrease her fasting; and about a year after that "event, she received a direct injunction from God to fast for "three whole years upon nothing but bread and water." (p. 257.)

I shall not further pursue this branch of the subject. What has been now adduced is quite enough for my purpose, which is, to afford some general notion of the consequences which naturally flow from your doctrine of Temporal penalties, and Satisfactions for them. If it be true, as you imagine, that God *reserves* awful "scourges" in his hands, when he receives the pardoned sinner into his favour; if God is still in "wrath" and "anger" with justified believers, if they are still liable to the demands of his "justice" and of his "vengeance;" if the temporal punishments which he "reserves" are, while they last, of the same sort as those of Hell; and if the wrath of God and the infernal tortures which he designs to inflict on his justified and sanctified children, may be *averted* by their inflicting on themselves torments in this life; I most fully admit, that it is the duty of every Christian to live in a state of fear and of torment. No amount of bodily suffering can be considered excessive, if it can appease the wrath of God and avert his vengeance. A soul bowed down beneath the miserable thought that it is

not at peace with God, will act naturally and even piously in seeking for the greatest amount of afflictions and mortifications that can be obtained during life. Who that believes in God, and regards him as the Fountain of all good,—who that feels the *reality* of his existence, his promises, and his threatenings, would hesitate to do any works, or submit to any sufferings, in order to gain his favour? Faith would oblige him to stretch forth both his hands for this bitter cup, and drain it to the very dregs.

You therefore act only *consistently,* when your lives are spent in the most dreadful mortifications and penances for remitted sins. You hold that *Contrition* does not generally remit all the "scourges" due to your sins, or restore you to peace with God; that *Confession* and *Absolution* still leave you in the same state of uncertainty; that *Satisfaction* enjoined by the Confessor does not render you secure; that *Indulgences* may fail: and, in fine, that *voluntary Satisfactions, voluntary penances during life,* are the only remedy which you can adopt in this world. If therefore a Romanist *understands* the system taught by authority in his Church, and be *earnest* in his religious views, he must spend a life of self-inflicted torment.

Nor is this all. If Contrition, and Confession, and Absolution; if imposed Satisfactions, and Indulgences afford no assurance of the remission of God's "scourges;" what assurance can there be, that a life of torment will avert them? What reasonable assurance can there be, that *self-imposed* obligations can succeed, when the *Divine* method of obtaining remission of sin,—when true Repentance, that "second plank," as St. Jerome calls it, has failed? For let us consider a moment, that according to your doctrine, a temporal punishment EQUAL TO THAT OF HELL is due to your remitted sins. Now is it to be imagined for a moment, that any penances which we may suffer in this short life, can be an equivalent for torments resembling those of Hell? Remember that you know not *how long* the pains of Purgatory may continue; you know nothing more about them, than that they are *superior* to any sufferings endured in this life, that they resemble those of Hell. If then Divine JUSTICE is to be satisfied even "to the last farthing" as you allege; what reasonable ground is there for believing, that even a *life* of self-imposed penances can appease the wrath of God, and save you from the dread scourges of his vengeance in Purgatory?

The necessary result then of your doctrine of Temporal punishments and Satisfactions is, that the contrite and justified child of God, the chosen vessel of his grace, the sanctified instrument

of his will, is bound to spend his life in penal labours and self-inflicted torments, without any well founded hope of appeasing the *wrath* of God. He is to look on his God as still frowning in anger upon him; to think with anguish of the scourges and tortures of the damned, which God is preparing to shower upon him. This is to be his feeling through life; and even in death he is to look on God as still probably *unreconciled;* and as only awaiting the moment of his departure from this life, to hurry his soul into that fire which is prepared for the Devil and his angels!

And is this the hope, is this the peace, the joy, the consolation, which you offer to Christians? You are loud in your assurances that the sacrament of Penance brings peace and consolation to the wounded conscience. According to the Council of Trent, "the substance and effect of the sacrament of Penance, as far "as relates to its power and efficacy, is *reconciliation with God,* "which sometimes produces in pious persons, and those who "receive this sacrament with devotion, *peace and tranquillity* "*of conscience,* with *vehement consolation of spirit.*"[z] In the same manner, the Catechism of the Council of Trent observes, that "the whole efficacy of Penitence consists in its restoring "us to the favour of God, and uniting us in the utmost friend-"ship with Him; and this reconciliation is sometimes followed "in the case of pious men who receive this sacrament in a holy "and religious manner, by the *greatest peace and tranquillity* "*of conscience,* with *exceeding joyfulness of spirit.*"[a] Dr. Milner, one of your nominal bishops, apostrophizes the sacrament of Penance thus: "O *sweet balm of the wounded spirit!* "O sovereign restorative of the soul's life and vigour!"[b] and observes, that Romanists continually find persons who are desirous "of laying the sins of their youth and their ignorances at "the feet of some one or other of" the Romish ministers, "con-"vinced that thereby they would procure *ease to their afflicted* "*souls.*"[c] Trevern, Bishop of Strasburg, in describing the penitence of a Roman Catholic, says, that his spiritual director, "when he judges him sufficiently disposed, exhorts him to "employ redoubled fervour in his approaches to reconciliation, "in order to obtain by humble prayers God's ratification of the "sentence of pardon which will be pronounced to him on earth: "when the moment has arrived, he pronounces solemnly this "wished for Absolution; then *consolation, calm, and ease,* "enter the conscience of the penitent, in place of the *burden*

[z] Conc. Trid. Sessio xvi c. iii.
[a] Catechismus, Pars ii. c. xxxiii.
[b] End of Controversy, Lett. xx
[c] Ib. Lett. xli.

" which had before oppressed him. *He feels himself altogether* " *different from what he was; he is no more the same man.*"[d]

Such are the delights which you promise in the sacrament of Penance; but how delusively! Is it consolation, to know that we are still, after the remission of sins, liable to the demands of " Divine *justice?*" Is it peace, to feel that we are still subject to God's " wrath ?" Is it joy to think that we are subject to his " vengeance;" to the " scourges which he still " retains in his hands ?" Is it rest, to feel that a life of torment will not suffice to appease the " anger" of God, and that even beyond the grave his " vengeance" will pursue us amidst the torments of the damned ? Is this peace, consolation, reconciliation, calmness, tranquillity of conscience, hope in this world and in the next ? Nay, is this REMISSION OF SINS ?

What *is* Remission of sins, if it be not remission of their *penalties*, and of the *anger* of God so justly due to them ? If the penalties of sin were retained, sin would not be remitted. When we say that a sin is pardoned, we mean that God forgives its guilt and its penalties, that He is reconciled to the penitent sinner, and that his anger is appeased. If then, as you maintain, God is still unreconciled to the sinner, still in wrath, still seeking for punishment, still reserving some of the scourges due to sin; it cannot be that sin has been remitted—the sinner must still be alienated from God; unless you would maintain that God is reconciled and unreconciled, forgiving and unforgiving, appeased and unappeased, angry and well-pleased at the same moment towards the same person.

Your doctrine, Sir, needs only to be known, to secure its rejection by every one who can (even imperfectly) feel the love and mercy of God, the consistency of his dealings with his creatures, the nature of the remission of sins, and the privileges of a state of justification and grace. To state your doctrine is to refute it. This is all I have been able to do in this Letter; I have not entered on any refutation of the arguments you advance in its favour, nor have I brought the weight of Scripture and of Catholic Tradition to its overthrow. This must form the subject of another Letter; but before I close the present, I must make some further observations on the subject of satisfactions and mortifications, with a view to prevent misrepresentations.

Do not imagine then, that in condemning the load of observances, of servile works, and of self-inflicted tortures, which your system imposes on its votaries, with a view to obtain remission of the temporal penalties of their sins, we mean in any degree to remove the obligation of self denial, and the expe-

[d] Discuss. Amic. t. ii. p. 201.

diency of a reasonable degree of mortification. We have no intention to speak with any thing except reverence of the austerities of the ancient saints, though they may appear to us in several instances excessive, and not to be imitated. But the reason for which we distinguish between these austerities and those which you recommend is, because they are performed on totally different motives. The saints of old mortified their senses; underwent many afflictions; sat in sackcloth and ashes; wept and mourned; spent their lives in self denial; were abundant in fruits of penitence: but what was their *motive?* It was either to obtain remission of sin *not yet remitted*, or else to mortify the passions and wishes of the natural man, and to conform themselves to the image of their Divine Master. Their *motive* then was what we cannot but approve; though we may not think it necessary for Christians to undertake such *severe* exercises of self-denial as many holy men have practised.

But what is *your* motive in recommending such painful works? It is to obtain remission of a portion of the penalties of sin *already remitted:* it is to appease the anger of a God, whose anger is *already appeased.* Mortifications have with you taken a new character: they are no longer merely what they were to the saints, means of subduing evil habits and inclinations, and of detaching the soul from sublunary concerns. No: they are *expiations for sins remitted—atonements* made to an offended God for sins which he has *pardoned. Such* mortifications and penances are worse than useless. They are mistaken; injurious to God; inconsistent with the spirit of the Gospel, and with the belief and practice of Catholic Antiquity. It is to *such* satisfactions that we do most strongly object, and against which we shall always contend to the utmost of our power.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

WILLIAM PALMER.

Oxford, May 3, 1841.

A FOURTH LETTER

TO

N. WISEMAN, D. D.

A

FOURTH LETTER

TO

N. WISEMAN, D. D.

ON THE ROMISH DOCTRINE

OF

SATISFACTIONS.

(CONCLUDED.)

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M. A.

OF WORCESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

BALTIMORE:
JOSEPH ROBINSON,
110 BALTIMORE STREET.

1843.

A FOURTH LETTER, &c.

Sir,

In my last Letter little more was done than to *state* your doctrine of Satisfaction, and to point out a few of its consequences. I am persuaded that a candid examination of those consequences, and of the contrasts (also noticed) between the Gospel and your doctrines on this subject, ought to suffice for the satisfaction of any reasonable mind; but in order to prevent any possibility of escape, it may be advisable to examine in detail the various arguments which yourself and other Romish controversialists have advanced, in support of your view of Satisfactions, and to establish the Catholic doctrine opposed to yours by the authority of Scripture and of Catholic Tradition.

Let me then again state your doctrine of Satisfaction. According to the Catechism of Trent, "Satisfaction is *com-* "*pensation* for the injury done to another,"[a] and more particularly "that *compensation*, when man *pays somewhat to God* "*for the sins which he has committed.*"[b] Tournely says, that Satisfaction is "*the payment of a debt* which was contracted "by sin or by offending God."[c] You yourself and other Roman theologians always employ the term as equivalent to the *payment of a debt* due to Divine Justice.

With reference to the particular debt which is to be discharged by Satisfaction, you speak thus: "We believe that "upon this forgiveness of sins, [in the Sacrament of Penance,] "that is, after the remission of that eternal debt, which God in "his justice awards to transgressions against his law, he has "been pleased to reserve a certain degree of inferior or tem- "porary punishment, appropriate to the guilt which had been "incurred; and it is on this part of the punishment *alone*, that, "according to the Catholic doctrine, satisfaction can be made "to God." (Lectures ii. 41.)

[a] Ita satisfactio nihil aliud est quam injuriæ alteri illatæ compensatio. Pars ii. c. 85.

[b] Cùm homo pro peccatis commissis Deo aliquid persolvit Ibid.

[c] Solutio est debiti quod contractum est ex delicto seu offensâ Dei. De Pœnit. t. ii. p. 2.

What are your arguments in support of this doctrine?

1. You appeal to our "natural feelings" in proof that calamities and sufferings in this world are intended as punishments for our sins pardoned. (p. 42.) That appeal I have already answered, and have proved, that this attempt to connect suffering with the sin of him who commits it, leads to the inference that our Lord himself was sinful, which is a damnable heresy. I have also shewn, that it is an article of faith that calamities and sufferings are sent to the justified, in order in purify their hearts, and to procure for them a higher degree of glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ.

II. Your next appeal is to the holy Scripture. "The very "first principles of moral conduct, whether in the Old or the "New Law, seem connected with the necessity of purifications "and works, painful or disagreeable, or with sufferings sent by "Divine Providence, as inflictions justly deserved. Thus, we "remark constantly in the Old Law visible demonstrations of "repentance and sorrow, *after sin has been forgiven*." (Lectures ii. 43.)

In proof of this, we are referred (p. 43.) to the case of David's punishment for his conduct to Uriah (2 Kings xii. 14.); to the chastisement inflicted for numbering the people (2 Kings xxiv. 11.); and to the penalty suffered by Moses and Aaron for their sin, (Numb. xx. 12, 24. Deut. xxxiv. 4.) These passages have been examined in my Second Letter, in which it has been shewn, that God's mode of dealing with mankind in those ages *required* the infliction of such punishments, but that under the Gospel they are no longer requisite. In the *second* case mentioned, the chastisement was not inflicted for *pardoned* sin, and therefore it cannot assist you.

Your next proofs are as follows: "We see Job, after he had "transgressed in words, or rather exceeded in speech, therefore "humbling himself, and declaring that he did penance in dust "and ashes (Job xlii. 6.); when the men of Nineveh had their "destruction proclaimed to them by the Prophet, the most obvious and natural expiation of their sins, appeared to them the "publication of a general fast; and all from the king on his "throne to the very animals in their stalls, were commanded "to fast for three days, saying, 'Who can tell if God will turn "and forgive, and will turn away from his fierce anger, and "we shall not perish.' (Jonas iii. 9.)"

Nothing, Sir, can more plainly demonstrate the difficulty under which you labour in the attempt to procure the support of Scripture for your doctrine, than this most unhappy appeal to the cases of Job, and of the men of Nineveh. It is perfectly

clear, that penitential works in both these instances were intended to obtain remission of the *guilt* and *punishment* of sin *not yet pardoned*, and that there is not the remotest ground for imagining, that they were designed to avert the *temporal* penalties of *remitted* sin. Job declares his "repentance in dust "and ashes" *immediately after he had been rebuked by God*, (chapter xl. xli.) The inhabitants of Nineveh repented with fasting, *immediately* after it had been said to them by Jonas, "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown." (Jonah iii. 4.) It was only *after* their "fasting" and "turning from "their evil ways," that God "repented of the evil that he had "said that he would do unto them; and he did it not," (verse 10.) Their sin, in short, was only forgiven *after* they had performed penitential works, whereas your doctrine is, that sin is forgiven *before* such works are offered, and that the latter only avert its temporal penalties. I shall hereafter prove to you, that works of repentance are necessary to the *forgiveness of sin* —a truth which your theologians *deny*, notwithstanding all their pretended advocacy of that branch of Repentance. The examples of Job and of the men of Nineveh establish this doctrine, while they are wholly opposed to your view.

You observe, that "our first parents' sin was forgiven, and yet the most bitter consequences were entailed on them and their posterity on its account (p. 44.);" but you forget that the sin of Adam, which has passed on *all men*, can be no measure of the effects of *other sins;* and that a sin, which God was bound *by his own special promise* to punish with temporal death, is widely different from *our sins*, which are under no such threat.

You next proceed to argue, that "if we find God, from the "beginning, forgiving sins with the reservation of some smaller "punishment, and at the same time, his chosen servants, in- "structed by him, acting under the conviction, that by penitential acts that punishment could be averted or mitigated, we "have equal reason to maintain, so long as there is nothing "positively defined to the contrary, that the punishment and "its expiation are continued in the New Testament." (Lectures ii. 44.)

I deny that the reserve of temporal punishments in some instances under the former dispensations, after sin has been remitted, implies any similar mode of dealing under the New Testament; because under former dispensations, God visibly ruled the world by a system of temporal rewards and punishments; and had *notorious* sin escaped without *any* penalty, (except in cases where God himself prescribed a way of remis-

sion, such as the offering of sacrifice,) the economy of the Divine government would have been disturbed, sin would have been encouraged, and its penalties no longer feared. But under the New Testament, God does not visibly govern the world by temporal rewards and punishments, therefore it is not necessary under the Gospel that remitted sin should be temporally punished; and no argument can be brought from God's conduct in this respect under former dispensations.

But besides this, I deny that there is any thing in the Old Testament, to lead us to suppose that temporal penalties threatened to remitted sins can be *averted*. Did David succeed in averting them by all his satisfactions or penitential works? Did Adam and Eve try to avert them? Did Moses and Aaron? As to the penitential works of Job, and of the men of Nineveh, they were intended to procure remission of *sin*, not merely remission of its temporal penalties after sin had been pardoned. I admit that penitential works are continued under the New Testament, but they are continued for something more than the remission of the *temporal penalties* of sin.

As to the objection to human satisfaction, arising "from its "being considered essentially derogating to Christ's infinite "merits," (Lectures ii. 45.) I am not disposed to maintain the validity of this objection here; because it would lead to a lengthened discussion, and the objection may in one sense be valid, and in another invalid. I shall therefore proceed to other matters.

Let us come then to your proofs from the New Testament. "Does our Saviour ever tell us, that from thenceforth fasting, "one of the most usual methods for afflicting the soul for sin "committed, shall cease under his law? Does he not, on the "contrary, assure us, that the moment he, the bridegroom, "should be taken away, his children should fast?" (p. 46.)

Certainly, he does so; but at the same moment he does not give the *slightest hint* that we are to fast for the purpose of procuring remission of the temporal penalties of our pardoned sins —which is exactly the point you have to establish.

"Did he reprove those who had believed that penance in "sackcloth and ashes was efficacious for the forgiveness of sin; "and not rather propose them as an example, and say that the "men of Nineveh shall arise in judgment against that genera- "tion, because at the preaching of Jonas, they did penance in "that way?" (Ibid.)

All very true, and at the same time *destructive of your doctrine*. For if our Saviour proposed as an example, those who "believed that penance in sackcloth and ashes was efficacious

"for the *forgiveness of sin*," he censured those who believe that "*upon the forgiveness of sins*, that is, *after* the remission of that eternal debt," God reserves a *temporal* punishment, and that "it is on this part of the punishment ALONE," that "satisfaction can be made to God." (p. 41.) I ask you therefore in your own words; "Does he, on any single occasion, limit "the efficacy of these practices, and tell his disciples, that if "hitherto they have been considered of value towards the "REMISSION OF SIN, they had from that moment lost that worth, "and were to be employed in future upon different principles, "and for different motives?" (p. 46.) How can you answer this question of your own? You do not admit that Satisfactions *remit sin*, though Jonah and the men of Nineveh, and our Lord himself, as you allow, teach that they *do* remit sin. You believe that *sin is remitted before satisfactions are undertaken;* that satisfactions are not necessary for the remission of sin, but *only* for the remission of its temporal penalties. What have you to say then?

Your concluding argument is as follows:

"But what shall we say of the language of St. Paul, when "he declares, writing to the Colossians, 'I now rejoice in my "sufferings for you, and fill up those things which are wanting "of the sufferings of Christ, in my flesh, for his body, which "is the Church?' (Coloss. i. 24.) What is wanting of "Christ's sufferings! And this to be supplied by man, and in "his flesh! What sort of doctrine call we this? Is it in favour of the completeness of Christ's sufferings, as to their "application? Or rather does it not suppose that much is to "be done by man, towards possessing himself of the treasures "laid up in our Saviour's redemption? And that suffering is "the means whereby this application is made?" (p. 47.)

Well: suppose all this true, and how does it prove your doctrine? Suppose if you please, that "much is to be done by "man," and "that suffering is the [*a*] means whereby this application is made." Does *this* prove that suffering is the means of obtaining remission of the *temporal penalties of pardoned sins?* I see no connexion whatever between such a conclusion, and those to which you have actually come. Suppose that sufferings inflicted by GOD (of which the Apostle speaks) conform the Christian to his Divine Master, and obtain a greater degree of glory; surely it does not follow, that sufferings, whether voluntarily undertaken, or imposed by God, remit the temporal penalties of forgiven sin. This may pass for good reasoning in the "*Roman schools*," but it is really quite beyond our dull northern understandings.

III. I now come to your proofs from Tradition, omitting various explanations which you afford as to the practice of your Church in the matter of Satisfaction.

"If what I have stated be the doctrine of the Gospel, we "must naturally expect to find some institution in the Church, "from its earliest times, for the faithful practice of so essential "a part of God's dispensations. And accordingly from the begin- "ning, we find nothing so prominently inculcated, either in the "writings of the early Fathers, or in the discipline of the uni- "versal Church, as this *necessity* of doing penance and making "satisfaction to God. It is the basis of the system, known by "the name of the penitential canons, in which those who had "transgressed were condemned to different punishments, accor- "ding to the measure of their offences . . . . This system surely "must have had its root in the strong conviction of the early "Church, that such practices were meritorious in the sight of "God; that they brought down *his mercy on the sinner*, and "*propitiated his wrath*. And what is all this but the belief of "the doctrine of Satisfaction?" (p. 49)

Excuse me, sir; this is indeed *a* doctrine of Satisfaction; but it is not yours. The primitive Church did, as you say, believe that penitential works "brought down God's mercy on sinners, "and propitiated his wrath," but they never believed that after the sinner was placed in a state of grace by the remission of his sins, he was *still* bound to perform penitential works with a view to appease the "wrath" of God. No, Sir, the Satisfactions required by the primitive Church were, as you doubtless know perfectly well, performed *before* Absolution was given, or the penitent restored to Communion.[d] *After* that restoration, no one ever dreamt of exacting penance from those who were thus reconciled, except when they had been admitted to Communion under the immediate apprehension of death. Thus then the whole practice of the primitive Church with reference to penances is wholly subversive of your doctrine. The primitive Church required penitential works before the remission of sin, therefore she believed them necessary to obtain the remission of *sin* ("culpa" as well as "pœna"); and she exacted no such works *after* sin was remitted, therefore she either did not believe them necessary for the remission of temporal penalties, or else held that they were unavailing. Be assured, Sir, that you will not find me amongst those modern "writers" to whom you

[d] See Morinus de Pœnitentia, lib. ix. c. 3, 15, 17, where he proves, that except in very peculiar and extreme cases, Absolution was given *after* Satisfaction had been performed, even up to the *twelfth* century.

allude, "who have treated of the practice of the Catholic "Church upon this point, as derived from the Fathers," and who, as you say, "*fairly give it up*." (p. 49.)

The passages which you proceed to quote from the Fathers are all condemnatory of your doctrine and practice, and directly establish that which I shall presently maintain in opposition to yours.

St. Cyprian, you say, writes thus: "Do entire penance; "evince the contrition of a sorrowing and grieving mind. That "penance which may satisfy, remains alone to be done; but "they shut the door to satisfaction, who deny the necessity of "penance. Whoso shall thus have made satisfaction to God, "and, by penance for his sin, have acquired more courage and "confidence from the very circumstance of his fall, he whom "the Lord has heard and aided, shall give joy to the Church; "he shall deserve not pardon only, but a crown." On this your own remark is, "whoever then does this penance, can merit not "only *pardon*, but a *crown of eternal reward*." (p. 50.)

I do not offer any remarks on the inaccurate and garbled nature of this quotation from St. Cyprian, though they are richly merited; but shall merely observe, that this holy Father, even according to your own interpretation, regarded penitential works or satisfactions as means of obtaining "pardon" of sins, and "a "crown of eternal reward." His notions of the value of satisfactions were therefore widely different from yours. You believe that sin and its eternal punishment are remitted *before* penitential works are performed. St. Cyprian believed such works necessary to the *remission of sin;* and in the Treatise from which the above passage is taken, condemns most vehemently those who admitted penitents to Communion, without any previous satisfaction.

"In the following and in succeeding centuries," you say, "we have innumerable passages from the Fathers who wrote re-"garding the penitential canons; we have them laying it down "as the principle of those laws, that *satisfaction was necessary* "*to expiate offences committed*." (p. 50.)

Certainly, Sir, they held penitential works necessary for the remission of sins *in general*, not merely for the remission of its *temporal penalties*, which is, you assure us, "the Catholic doctrine." (p. 41.) Therefore, by your own shewing, the Fathers are opposed to your doctrines. I pass on to your citations from St. Augustine, which are equally apposite for my purpose. The first is as follows:

"It is not *enough* that the sinner change his ways, and de-"part from his evil works, unless by penitential sorrow, by

"humble tears, by the sacrifice of a contrite heart, and by "alms-deeds, he make satisfaction to *God for what he has com-* "*mitted.*" (p. 50.)

Here is not a single word of Satisfaction as remitting only the *temporal* penalties of sin. The penitential works here recommended as necessary, were for the purpose of obtaining pardon of "what the sinner has committed," i. e. of his sin, his whole sin, *guilt* as well as *punishment, eternal* as well as *temporal* punishment.

"In the following words we have our doctrine clearly laid "down, that God, after he has pardoned sin, still punishes it "in his *justice.* 'Wash me from my sin,' said David.—Im- "plore mercy, but lose not sight of justice. In his mercy God "pardons sin: he punishes it in his justice. But what? Dost "thou seek for mercy, and shall sin remain unpunished? Let "David, let other sinners answer; let them answer with David, "that with him they may find mercy, and say, 'Lord my sin "shall not remain unpunished: I know his justice, whose "mercy I seek. It shall not remain unpunished: but that thou "mayest not punish it, I myself will.' Is not this precisely, "word for word, the Catholic doctrine at this time?" (p. 50.)

Undoubtedly, Sir, it is the Catholic doctrine, but it is not the *Romish.* St. Augustine is not speaking of *pardoned* sin. He does not recommend punishments for *pardoned* sin. He warns sinners not to depend on the *mercy* of God for the pardon of their sins, while His *justice* requires their punishment; and in order to avert the latter—the *full punishment* of sin, not merely its *temporal* punishment,—he advises them to punish themselves by penitential works. These works were intended to procure the *pardon of sin,* not to procure the remission of the temporal penalties of sin *already pardoned.* Therefore St. Augustine subverts your doctrine.

Such, Sir, are your citations from the Fathers! Such is the result of your appeal to Catholic tradition! You will presently find that Tradition is stored with arguments against your doctrine. The only embarrassment indeed is to know what to select from the vast and multitudinous body of evidence which may be brought to bear against you.

Having thus examined and proved the inconclusiveness of all your arguments in favour of the Romish doctrine of Satisfaction, I proceed to establish the Catholic doctrine on this subject,

taught by Scripture, and received by the Catholic Fathers, the Church of England, and the Reformation, and even admitted by the Council of Trent, and by some of your most eminent divines.

The position then which I shall maintain against you is, that "penitential works, such as fasting, almsgiving, weeping, and "works of piety, are together with contrition and confession to "God, means of obtaining the REMISSION OF SIN, and not "merely the remission of its temporal penalties."

It is not meant, that every sort of penitential work is requisite in every case of repentance, but in general, that *some* fruits or works of repentance are always parts of true repentance.

The reason for which such works are expected from him who desires to return into the favour of God is, because Repentance, unaccompanied by any fruits of a changed mind, would be *dead* and unprofitable. Our Lord himself lays it down as a principle, "Ye shall know them by their *fruits*. Do men gather "grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good "tree bringeth forth good fruit, but a corrupt tree bringeth forth "evil fruit." Matt. vii. 16. If Repentance then brings forth no fruits of repentance, no signs of contrition, of humiliation, of charity towards God and man; it is not a genuine repentance. The Apostle teaches us to judge of the reality of *Faith* by its fruits: "Faith without works is *dead*." James ii. 20. And so likewise is Repentance, without its works, dead; for what is Repentance, but Faith mourning over sin, and stimulated by love to newness of life?

Repentance then, without *works* of repentance, or external signs of a changed heart, (which the Fathers often call Satisfactions,)[e] is a dead and unprofitable repentance, and does not procure the remission of sins. I speak here of the *ordinary* course of God's dealings with man; for as I do not deny, that God has in some cases saved believers without the actual performance of *good works;* so there is no difficulty in supposing that He also reserves the power of saving penitents (in some

[e] When the Fathers speak of "Satisfactions" and of "satisfying God," they did not mean that man can *pay the debt* which is due for *his sin*, and which the merits of Christ alone can discharge: their meaning was, that man may, through Divine grace, do works expressive of contrition, and thus tending to propitiate God's favour. We still retain in some degree the ancient meaning of the term, when we say, that "we are *satisfied* with such a person," i. e. *contented* at his conduct. "Satisfaction" also was often used to express the Canonical penance, the *right* performance of which was supposed to restore the penitent to the Divine favour. Dallæus, de Pœnis, l. vii. c. 4. furnishes many examples.

peculiar cases) without *works of penitence*. But these are special exceptions from the ordinary course of his government.

The doctrine which I have just stated, is in accordance with that of the Church of England, as will appear by the following extracts from the Homilies.

"When the whole multitude of men, women, and children, "in a township or city, yea through a whole country, do fast, "it is called a public fast. Such was that fast which the "whole multitude of the children of Israel were commanded to "keep the tenth day of the seventh month, because Almighty "God appointed that day to be a cleansing day, a day of atone-"ment, a time of *reconciliation*, a day wherein the people "*were cleansed from their sins*. The order and manner how "it was done is written in the sixteenth and twenty-third "chapter of Leviticus. That day the people did *lament*, "*mourn, weep, and bewail* their former sins. And whosoever "upon that day did not *humble his soul, bewail his sins*, as is "said, *abstaining from all bodily food* until the evening, 'that "soul,' saith Almighty God, 'should be destroyed from among "his people' .... Upon the ordinance of the general fast, good "men took occasion to appoint to themselves private fasts, at "such times as they did either earnestly lament their *sinful "lives*, or did addict themselves to more fervent prayer, that it "might please God *to turn his wrath from them*, when either "they were admonished and brought to the consideration there-"of by the preaching of the Prophets, or otherwise when they "saw present danger hung over their heads. This *sorrowful-"ness of heart* joined with *fasting*, they uttered sometimes by "their outward behaviour and gesture of body, putting on sack-"cloth, sprinkling themselves with ashes and dust, and sitting "or lying upon the earth.

"For when good men feel in themselves the heavy burden "of sin, see damnation to be the reward of it, and behold with "the eye of their mind the horror of hell, they tremble, they "quake, and are inwardly touched with sorrowfulness of heart "for their offences, and cannot but accuse themselves, and open "this their grief unto Almighty God, and call unto him for "mercy. This being done seriously, their mind is so occupied, "partly with sorrow and heaviness, partly with an earnest de-"sire to be delivered from this danger of hell and damnation, "that *all desire of meat and drink is laid apart*, and loath-"someness of all worldly things and pleasures cometh in place; "so that nothing then liketh them more, than *to weep, to la-"ment, to mourn, and both with words and behaviour of body, "to shew themselves weary of this life*. Thus did David fast

"when he made intercession to Almighty God for the child's "life . . . . King Ahab fasted after this sort, when it repented "him of murdering of Naboth, bewailing his own sinful doings. "Such was the Ninevites' fast, brought to repentance by Jonas's "preaching. When forty thousand of the Israelites were slain "in battle against the Benjamites, the Scripture saith, 'All the "children of Israel, and the whole multitude of the people, "went to Bethel, and sat there weeping before the Lord, and "fasted all that day till night.' So did Daniel, Esther, Nehe-"miah, and many others in the Old Testament, fast."[f]

"It is our part to rend our hearts and not our garments, as "we are advertised by the Prophet Joel; that is, our *sorrow* "*and mourning* must be inward in the heart, and not in out-"ward show only." . . . . Amongst the ends of fasting the following is mentioned: "That our fast be a testimony and wit-"ness with us before God, of our humble submission to his high "Majesty, when we confess and acknowledge our sins unto him, "and are inwardly touched with sorrowfulness of heart, bewail-"ing the same in the *affliction of our bodies*." (Ibid.)

In allusion to the case of the people of Nineveh the Homily says, "And upon this their hearty repentance, thus *declared* "*outwardly* with fasting, renting of their clothes, putting on "sackcloth, and sprinkling themselves with dust and ashes, the "Scripture saith, 'God saw their works, that they turned from "their evil ways; and God repented of the evil, &c.'"[g]

Thus far we have seen fasting and mortifications considered as parts of true Repentance. We now come to almsgiving.

"'Give alms,' saith he (our Lord), 'and behold all things "are clean unto you.' He teacheth them, that to be merciful "and charitable in helping the poor, is the means to keep the "soul pure and clean in the sight of God. We are taught there-"fore by this, that merciful alms-dealing is profitable to purge "the soul from the infection and filthy spots of sin. The same "lesson doth the Holy Ghost also teach in sundry places of the "Scripture, saying, 'Mercifulness and almsgiving purgeth from "all sins, and delivereth from death, and suffereth not the soul "to come into darkness.' A great confidence may they have "before the high God that shew mercy and compassion to them "that are afflicted. The wise preacher, the Son of Sirach, "confirmeth the same, when he saith, 'that as water quencheth "burning fire, even so mercy and alms resisteth and reconcileth "sins.' . . . . . Wherefore that holy Father Cyprian taketh "good occasion to exhort earnestly . . . to relieve the needy

[f] Sermon of Fasting, Part, I. [g] Sermon of Fasting, Part II.

"and help the afflicted, by the which we may purge our sins "and heal our wounded souls."[h]

In the Homily which treats particularly of Repentance, it is stated, that God requires in real penitents not only to forsake their sins, but to give their hearts, souls, and bodies to the service of God. "And because that we are letted by the natural "corruption of our own flesh, and the wicked affections of the "same, he doth bid us also return with *fasting* . . . . whereunto "he doth add, *weeping and mourning*, which do contain an "outward profession of repentance, which is very needful and "necessary."[i]

"If we will have the wrath of God pacified, we must in no "wise dissemble, but turn unto him again with a true and sound "repentance, which may be known and declared by *good fruits*, "as by most sure and infallible signs thereof. They that do "from the bottom of their hearts acknowledge their sins, and "are unfeignedly sorry for their offences . . . . . will from hence-"forwards with all diligence give themselves to innocency, "pureness of life, and true godliness. We have the Ninevites "for our example. . . . . But above all other, the history of "Zaccheus is most notable: for being come unto our Saviour "Jesus Christ, he did say, 'Behold, Lord, the half of my goods "I give to the poor; and if I have defrauded any man, or "taken aught away by extortion or fraud, I do restore him "fourfold.'"[k]

The same doctrine was taught by the Confession of Augsburgh,[l] and by the Apology of the Confession in the following terms, "Although we think that *Repentance ought to produce* "*good fruits* on account of the glory and the command of God, "and *good fruits* are commanded by God, such as *real fasting*, "*real prayer, real alms, &c.;* yet we no where find in holy "Scripture that eternal punishments are not remitted except "on account of the punishment of purgatory or canonical satis-"factions,[m] &c." So that fasting, prayers, and alms, are here admitted to be fruits, signs, or points of real repentance.

In these various passages we may observe, that the penitential works of fasting, alms giving, and prayer, are all regarded

[h] Sermon of Alms-deeds, Part II. [i] Sermon of Repentance, Part I. [k] Part II.

[l] Deinde sequi debent opera, quæ sunt fructus pœnitentiæ. Conf. August. c. xii.

[m] Quanquam igitur sentimus, quod pœnitentia debeat bonos fructus parere propter gloriam et mandatum Dei, et boni fructus habent mandata Dei, vera jejunia, veræ orationes, veræ eleemosynæ, &c. Apol. Conf. August. vi. (De Confessione et Satisfactione.) See also the Confessio Helvetica, cap. xiv.

as *parts of true repentance*, as *fruits which testify its reality*, and as *conducive directly to the remission of sin*. This is the doctrine which I am about to maintain against you.

I. From Scripture.

All the passages which you and other Romish theologians have cited in support of your doctrine of Satisfactions, go directly to prove, that such penitential works are means of obtaining remission of the *whole sin*, (culpa and pœna)

"Turn ye even to me with all your heart, and with fasting, "and with weeping, and with mourning: and turn unto the "Lord your God, for he is gracious and merciful, slow to "anger, and of great kindness, and repenteth him of the evil." (Joel ii. 12.) This was obviously designed for the purpose of obtaining *remission of sin*.

"God saw their works that they turned from their evil "ways; and God repented of the evil that he had said he "would do unto them; and he did it not." (Jonah iii. 10.) That is, he *forgave their sin*, not merely its temporal penalties.

"Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes." (Job xlii. 6.) Job did then penitential works to obtain pardon of his *sin*, (see ch. xl. xli.) ; not of its temporal penalties alone.

"If the mighty works which were done in you had been "done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago "in sackcloth and ashes." (Matt. xi. 21.) In these words our Saviour recognises external works of repentance, as a part of true repentance, and therefore as conducive to the remission of *sin*, not of its temporal penalties.

"O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from "the wrath to come. Bring forth therefore fruits meet for re-"pentance." (Matt. iii. 7.) In this case, "fruits of repentance" are mentioned as the means of escaping "the wrath to come," that is, of obtaining remission of the *guilt* and *eternal punishment* of sin.

"I keep under my body and bring it into subjection; lest "that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself "should be a castaway." (1 Cor. ix. 27.) This passage obviously does not speak of Satisfactions for sins, but of mortification of the senses and self denial, with a view to prevent the occurrence of sin. But if it did relate to Satisfactions, it would only prove that they are necessary to the remission of the *guilt* of sin: "Lest I myself should be a *castaway*."

"Wherefore O king, let my counsel be acceptable unto thee, "and break off *thy sins* by righteousness, and *thine iniquities* "by shewing mercy to the poor; if it may be a lengthening of "thy tranquillity." (Daniel iv. 27.) "By mercy and truth

"*iniquity is purged.*" (Prov. xvi. 6.) "Alms do deliver *from* "*death*, and suffereth not to come into *darkness.*" (Tobias iv. 11.) "Give alms of such things as ye have, and behold *all things are clean unto you*." (Luke xi. 41.)

In these passages, penitential works are spoken of as means of obtaining the *remission of sins*, not merely the *temporal penalties* of *remitted* sin. Your doctrine of Satisfactions is therefore not Catholic; it is not the doctrine of the word of God.

II I shall now prove from Catholic Tradition, that your view is altogether erroneous. It is the doctrine of all the Fathers, that penitential works, such as fasting, weeping, alms-giving, and mortifications, are conducive to the remission of the *whole sin*, i. e. both the guilt and the punishment of sin. And here I mean to avail myself of the proofs collected by your own writers to establish your doctrine of Satisfaction, all of which directly refute your error, and establish the truth for which I am contending. In citing the following passages from the "Faith of Catholics," by the popish priests Berington and Kirk,[n] I am far from pledging myself to their accuracy; but they will be quite sufficient in arguing with you, since you acknowledge your own obligations to the work in question,[o] which in fact furnishes all your writers with their whole stock of citations from the Fathers.

Tertullian, A. D. 200. Having spoken of the *public confession* of sin before the Church, he thus proceeds, "I admit it "is hard to make this confession; but suffering is the conse- "quence of *sin*. This suffering ends, and spiritual health be- "gins, when penance has been performed. But it may be that "besides the shame of confession, the severe discipline of "penance (some acts of which he enumerates) is likewise "feared." . . . "Should any one enquire why you are thus en- "gaged? say: *I have sinned against God*, and am in *danger* "*of perishing everlastingly*: wherefore, that *I may obtain for-* "*giveness*, I thus punish myself."[p] Can any words be more decisively opposed to your doctrine than these? You believe that penances do not *remit sin* or its *everlasting* punishment. You hold that they *only* remit the temporal penalties of *forgiven sin.*

St. Cyprian, A. D. 250. "Let us turn with our whole "mind to the Lord, and, expressing our repentance with true

[n] Faith of Catholics, &c. London, 1830.

[o] "The useful compilation of Messrs. Kirk and Berington, from which I have in general drawn my quotations of the Fathers." Wiseman's Lectures, vol. i. p. ix.

[p] Tertullian, De Pœnitentia, c. x. xi.

"sorrow, implore his *mercy*. Before him let the soul bow "down: to him let our sorrow make satisfaction: on him let "all our hope rest. By fasting, by tears, and by moaning, *let "us appease*, as he himself admonishes, his *indignation*."[q]

Council of Nice, A.D. 325. "In all cases the disposi- "tion and character of repentance must be considered. For "they who by fear, by tears, by patience, and by good works, "*manifest a sincere conversion*, when they shall have passed "over a certain time, and begun to communicate in prayer with "the faithful, to these the bishop may shew more indulgence;"[r] (i. e. by shortening the time of their penance, and admitting them at an early period to absolution.) Observe in this case, that penitential works are necessary to *manifest a sincere conversion*, and therefore that sin cannot be remitted without them.

St. Pacianus, A.D. 370. "Be not slow in having re- "course to the means of *salvation*: lower the mind by grief: "clothe the body in sackcloth; strew ashes on the head; fast; "implore the prayers of the faithful. As you spare not your- "selves, God will *spare* you. He is gentle, and patient, and "full of mercy, and *will reverse his sentence*. I promise: I am "surety for you; if you return by true satisfaction to your "Father, going astray no more, adding nothing to your former "sins, uttering the humble and plaintive words, Father, we "have sinned before thee, we are not worthy to be called thy "sons, he will *again receive you*, who says, *I will not the "death of the sinner*."[s] Satisfaction then is a mean of obtaining remission of sins, and of avoiding eternal death.

St. Ambrose, A.D. 390. "Let the Church weep for thee, "and by her tears wash away thy *sin:* may Christ see thee "weeping, that he may say, Blessed are they that mourn, for "they shall be comforted .... Therefore did he pardon Peter, "because he wept bitterly. And if thou weep in like manner, "Christ will look on thee, and *thy sin will be cancelled*."[t]

St. Augustine, A.D. 400. "To no one has he (God) "granted the liberty of sinning, although in mercy *he may for- "give past sins if due satisfaction be not neglected*."[u]

St. Leo, A.D. 450. "As for those Christians, who are "said to have polluted themselves by food offered to idols, my "answer is, that they *be purified* by penitential satisfactions, "which should be measured rather by the sorrow of the heart, "than by the length of the time."[v]

[q] Cyprian. De Lapsis, p. 191. [r] Can. xii. Conc. Gen. t. ii. p. 35.
[s] Parænn. ad Pœnit. Bibl. Patr. iv. 317. [t] De Pœnit. l. ii. c. x.
[u] Enchirid. c. lxx. [v] Ep. cxxix. al. lxxix. ad Nicet. Aquil.

Such, Sir, are the passages which your writers have culled from Antiquity, in proof that penitential works or satisfactions only remit *the temporal punishment* of sin; and I now ask you to produce, if you can, *one single passage* from any Christian writer for a thousand years after Christ, in which your doctrine is maintained. All the "dicta" of the Fathers which you have hitherto adduced, are condemnatory of your doctrine. Those Fathers exclaimed against the impiety of imagining, that sin can be remitted without any fruits of repentance, when such a dogma was first advanced. Hear the language of St. Cyprian, when some sinners had been admitted to absolution without any previous works of satisfaction.

"A new sort of *destruction* hath arisen, beloved brethren; "and as if the storm of persecution had raged but a little, a de- "ceitful *evil*, a gentle *ruin*, under the name of *mercy*, has been "accumulated on us. Contrary to the firmness of the Gospel, "contrary to that of our Lord towards the Law of God, some "persons rashly extend communion to heedless men; a vain "and false peace, perilous to those who give, and unavailing to "those who receive. They require no patience in recovering, "no real medicine by satisfaction. Repentance is driven from "their bosoms, the memory of the most grievous and extreme "sin is removed. . . Before sins are expiated; before confession "of the crime is made; before conscience is cleansed by the "sacrifice and the absolution of the priest; before the offence of "an indignant and threatening God is appeased, they suppose "that there is *peace;* which indeed they vaunt with deceitful "words. . . . This is another persecution, another temptation, "by which the subtle Enemy secretly assails and destroys the "lapsed, that their lamentation may cease, grief be silent, the "memory of sin vanish, the groaning of hearts be repressed, "the weeping of eyes be stopped, and the grievously offended "God be not deprecated by a long and full repentance."[y]

The whole Treatise from which the above passages are taken is sufficient to shew, that works of repentance were considered necessary for the *pardon of sin;* that it was unlawful to admit penitents to absolution without the previous performance of such works; and that there was not the remotest idea in those ages, that they remitted the temporal penalties due to *pardoned* sin.

But, Sir, it is not merely the whole body of ancient catholic tradition which is opposed to your doctrine of Satisfactions; I have to produce evidence from a quarter which you little expect, even from the Council of Trent itself.

[y] Cyprianus, De Lapsis.

It is the doctrine of the Council of Trent, that Satisfaction is *necessary for the remission of sins*—necessary to a real repentance. Hear its words: "The acts of the penitent himself, "that is, Contrition, Confession and *Satisfaction*, are as it were "the matter of this sacrament; which, *inasmuch as they are re-* "*quired by the Divine institution* to the completeness of the "sacrament, and *the full and perfect remission of sins*, are for "this reason called *parts of repentance*."[z] Thus, you see, Satisfaction is requisite to the *remission of sin itself*—not merely to the remission of the *temporal penalties* of sin already *remitted*. In another place the Council teaches the same doctrine; "It "is agreeable to the Divine goodness that *our sins should not be* "*forgiven without Satisfaction*, lest taking occasion therefrom, "we should think lightly of them, &c."[a] In fine, we have the following canon, "If any one deny, that in order to the *full and* "*perfect remission of sins*, three acts are requisite in the peni-"tent, (constituting as it were the matter of the sacrament of "Penitence,) that is to say, Contrition, Confession, *and Satis-*"*faction*, which are called the *three parts of Repentance*. . . . "*Let him be Anathema!*"[b] Here, Sir your doctrine is anathematized by the Council of Trent! you maintain that sin is *pardoned, remitted, forgiven*, by Confession and Absolution; and that Satisfaction, which comes afterwards, only remits its *temporal penalties*. So that you are in this dilemma. If sin is not perfectly forgiven by Confession and Absolution as you believe it to be, and if Satisfaction remits more than temporal penalties, then your whole doctrine of Satisfaction is based on a false foundation; but if sin is perfectly forgiven without Satisfaction, you must maintain that the Council of Trent is in error. Either alternative is quite sufficient for me

In fact, Sir, why do you, notwithstanding the opinions generally current in your communion, always exact from penitents in Confession an undertaking to do some works of Satisfaction—to perform some penance or other? You would think it unlawful to give Absolution without having previously imposed some such penances, and you believe that the penitent must have the

[z] Sessio xiv. cap. iii. [a] Ib c. viii.

[b] Si quis negaverit, ad integram et perfectam peccatorum remissionem requiri tres actus in pœnitente, quasi materiam Sacramenti pœnitentiæ, videlicet, Contritionem, Confessionem, et Satisfactionem, quæ tres pœnitentiæ partes dicuntur: aut dixerit, duas tantùm esse pœnitentiæ partes, terrors scilicet incussos conscientiæ, agnito peccato, et fidem conceptam ex Evangelio vel absolutione, quâ credit quis sibi per Christum remissa peccata; anathema sit. Sess. xiv. can. 4.

intention of executing that penance, in order to obtain remission of his sins by Absolution. What is this after all, but a tacit confession, that Satisfaction *is* in some way *essential* to the full effect of the sacrament of Penance—that it is *essential* to *the remission of sin?* You accept indeed a *quasi* satisfaction, an *intention* of doing penance, where the Scriptures and Catholic Tradition require a *real* satisfaction; but still, you *do* require a sort of *virtual* satisfaction in order to the *remission of sin.* So that your own practice condemns your doctrine of Satisfaction.

But your doctrine of Satisfaction is not only condemned by Scripture, by Tradition, by the Council of Trent, and by your own practice: it is actually rejected by some of your own theologians. Morinus, in his celebrated work on Penance, remarks, that the following "axiom was introduced into the minds of all "Christians by the Fathers, 'That Satisfactions imposed by "the Church and strenuously performed, *not only satisfied and* "*expunged temporal punishments, but eternal;* that they drew "down the mercy of God on sinners, and obtained pardon of "their crimes.'"[c] Morinus observes, that it was the hope of obtaining remission of *sins*, that induced penitents in those ages to undergo such long and severe penances; and that this doctrine formed the basis of all the exhortations of the Fathers to repentance. He cites Maldonatus, one of your most eminent Jesuits, as saying, "I do not doubt that *all the ancient Authors* "acknowledged that Satisfaction was for the *guilt* (*culpa*). "For they did not suppose that God remitted the guilt of sins, "before the penitent had appeased Him by external penances: "nor did the priests believe that they could give Absolution to "the penitent before, as interpreters of the Divine will, they "had seen the sinner perform such a penance, that it was credi-"ble that God was already reconciled to him."[d] Morinus

[c] Alterum disciplinæ penitentialis fundamentum, quod nobis hujus libri initio explicandum proposuimus, hoc est axioma Christianorum omnium animis à Patribus insinuatum, Satisfactiones ab Ecclesia impositas diligenter et strenuè peractas non tantùm pœnæ temporariæ sed etiam æternæ satisfactorias esse, et expunctrices, animam purgare et emaculare, Dei misericordiam in peccatores allicere, et scelerum veniam ab eo impetrare.' Morinus, De disciplinâ Sacramenti Pœnitentiæ, lib. iii. c. xi. p. 159. Ed. Bruxellis 1685.

[d] Non dubito, inquit Joannes Maldonatus, quin omnes veteres Authores satisfactionem agnoverint pro culpa. Nam non putabant Deum culpam remittere peccatorum, priusquam externis pœnitentiis Deum placassent: Neque sacerdotes putabant dare posse pœnitenti Absolutionem, priusquam, quasi interpretes Divinæ voluntatis, viderent eam pœnitentiam egisse peccatorem, ut credibile esset Deum jam illi esse placatum. Morinus, ibid.

afterwards refers to Estius and Sylvius, as making the same admissions; and to Lensæus, an eminent theologian of Louvain, whose work was approved by that University. The latter, according to Morinus, maintained, that Satisfactions were imposed, "to appease the anger of an indignant God, and that a "complete *abolition of sins* might, in that manner, be obtained;" and that by Satisfactions, "a man is relieved, cleansed, ex- "cused, absolved; a remedy applied for the recovery of *salva-* "*vation*; *eternal punishments* expunged; *the fire of Hell ex-* "*tinguished*."[e] The same author proves his doctrine at great length from the Fathers. Morinus also quotes Albaspinæus, the learned bishop of Orleans, as maintaining that Satisfactions *remit sin;* a position which he establishes in many ways.

In fine, Morinus himself, having spoken of those theologians whose doctrines lead to the conclusion, that "all *satisfaction* "relates only to *temporal punishments*," says, "Whether this "opinion can agree with the most undeniable discipline of the "ancients, let others judge."

Thus you see, that what you adduce as "the *Catholic* doc- "trine of Satisfaction," is so far from being so, that it has not even been approved by all your own theologians. I admit indeed, that it is *now universally received* amongst you, however inconsistent it be with Catholic antiquity, and with the Council of Trent. All your modern approved writers agree, that Satisfaction obtains only the remission of *temporal punishments;* the *sin itself* having been previously remitted. This is the doctrine which you yourself maintain, as I have shewn at the beginning of this Letter.

Having now completed the refutation of your doctrine of Satisfaction, and having established the Catholic doctrine in opposition to it, I shall submit to your consideration certain conclusions which follow from a review of the whole discussion.

I. In my former Letter it was proved, that your doctrine of Satisfactions or Penances necessarily leads to the conclusion, that after sin has been pardoned, God's anger and wrath still remain to be appeased, and consequently that the remission of sin is merely *nominal*.

[e] Verùm eo propriè relatas fuisse (satisfactiones) ut Deo satisfieret, ejusque indignantis ira placaretur, plenaque ista ratione percipi posset abolitio peccatorum . . . . Per hoc idcirco studium satisfactionis hominem relevari, mundari, excusari, absolvi, ad salutem recuperandam remedium adhiberi, æterna supplicia expungi, gehennæ ignem extingui," &c. Morinus, ibid.

II. It was also proved, that according to your doctrine, God is actuated by *contradictory* dispositions towards the justified; that he is at once satisfied and dissatisfied, pleased and displeased; that he loves and hates the same persons at the same moment.

III. It was further proved, that, according to your doctrine, a Christian is bound to pass his whole life in enduring self-inflicted torments and laborious works, under an uncertain hope of appeasing the wrath of God.

IV. It was also shewn, that you are not satisfied with imposing this grievous burden on Christians, but that you teach them to consider themselves alienated from God, exposed to his wrath, vengeance, and hatred, during their whole lives, and even at the hour of death.

V. It has been shewn, that your doctrine renders it impossible for those who receive it, ever perfectly to love God.

VI. In the present Letter, I have proved that your doctrine of Satisfaction is without any proof from Scripture or Tradition. Consequently it cannot be Catholic.

VII. It has been also proved, that Scripture, Tradition, the Council of Trent, and some of your own most eminent Divines, concur in establishing the truth taught by the Church of England, that penitential works are a part of true Repentance, and as such, remit sin both as to its guilt and its punishment (*culpa* and *pœna*). Consequently your doctrine of Satisfaction, which asserts that penitential works are only useful for the remission of *temporal penalties*, is *directly erroneous*, and approximates to heresy.

VIII. Scripture and Catholic Tradition teach, that remission of sins is not obtained without penitential works. Therefore you are *in error* in pronouncing the Absolution of sins, without any previous fruits of repentance; and your Absolutions are, generally speaking, *invalid*.

IX. Scripture and Tradition teach, that penitential works are necessary to obtain pardon of sin; but all your modern divines maintain, that they are not an *essential* part of the Sacrament of Penitence,[f] and on this principle give Absolution

[f] Satisfactio, seu pœnitentia à Confessario data, est necessaria necessitate non sacramenti sed præcepti . . . . . est pars sacramenti non *essentialis*, sed integralis tantum. Ligorio, Theol. Mor. t. vi. p. 122. Communis theologorum sententia post Concilium Tridentinum assignat tres actus pœnitentis, nempe contritionem, confessionem, et satisfactionem pro materiâ proximâ Sacramenti Pœnitentiæ; duos quidem priores pro materiâ *essentiali*; tertium verò, nempe satisfactionem, pro materiâ integrante. Tournely, De Pœnit. t. i. p. 105. Sine illâ (satisfactione) valet absolutio data pœnitenti contrito et confesso, ut ostendemus suo loco inferius. Ib. p. 118.

before Satisfaction. Therefore your received doctrine is opposed to the word of God.

X. These errors are *universally received amongst you.* They are taught by all your theologians in modern times, and are believed by all your people. From which we learn, that *some* errors at least are received by all members of the Roman Obedience; and if some errors are universally received amongst you, there may be many more. You may be in error on *all the points* in which you differ from the Catholic and Apostolic Churches established amongst us.

And is it then for you and your co-religionists to assume the office of dictating to us what we are to believe? Can those who are in such gross errors themselves be fit monitors to others? Can those who quote passages from the Scriptures and the Fathers in favour of doctrines which they utterly subvert, be qualified either by learning or by intelligence to guide our opinions? Where is that boasted infallibility of received doctrines amongst you; when it has been shewn, that Scripture, Tradition, and the Council of Trent itself condemn your belief? Supposing that you could prove our Church in error on some points, (which however I utterly deny that you can do,) would there be any inducement to us to forsake the communion of our Church for the purpose of uniting ourselves to a community which is itself in error? But when the error is on *your* side; and when, by your own admission, *Catholic principles* may be maintained by those who are members of the Church of England; when, in short, our Churches are essentially Catholic, and your own separation from our Catholic and Apostolic Churches is consequently without excuse; how extreme would be the insanity, how desperate the wickedness, of that man, who should plunge his soul into eternal perdition, by forsaking the Communion of the Catholic Church in England, to unite himself to your corrupt and schismatical community!

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

WILLIAM PALMER.

Oxford, May 11, 1841.

A

FIFTH LETTER

TO

N. WISEMAN, D. D.

CONTAINING

A REPLY

TO HIS

REMARKS ON LETTER I.

WITH ADDITIONAL PROOFS OF THE

IDOLATRY AND SUPERSTITION OF ROMANISM.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M. A.

OF WORCESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

BALTIMORE:
JOSEPH ROBINSON,
110 BALTIMORE STREET.

1843.

A FIFTH LETTER, &c.

§. 1. *Introductory Remarks.*

SIR,

WHEN you thought it necessary to call publicly on a clergyman of the English Church for proofs of charges which he had made years before against the doctrines and practice of Romanists, and which has been just repeated without any peculiar reference to yourself, or any other circumstance which particularly obliged you at this time to make such a demand; and when you availed yourself of this opportunity to present the doctrines of your Communion to the notice of the English public; it does not seem to me that you have any reason to complain, if another clergyman uses the same liberty which you have yourself taken, and proceeds with a discussion to which you have led the way.

The question which formed the principal subject of my first Letter was one, which most deeply and even vitally affects the religious character of Romanism. It was no less than this: Whether in the Church of Rome, created beings receive honours which are only due to God; whether this idolatrous worship is sanctioned and encouraged by authority amongst you, and is allowed generally by the members of the Roman communion without any protests or expressions of dissent.

In maintaining that such an idolatrous worship exists and is authorized amongst you; it was, at the same time, most readily admitted, that every Romanist is not necessarily an idolater;[a] because idolatry is *only allowed* and *sanctioned* in the Roman Church: it is not *enjoined* or *imposed* on all its members. This is a distinction which you are still unwilling to recognise, and by losing sight of it, you easily involve my statements in apparent contradiction.[b] Could time be spared for the discus-

[a] Letter I. p. 10, 30.

[b] Wiseman, Remarks, p. 6, 10—13. I shall only observe, that you are mistaken in supposing that I admit "an immense aggregate of *idolatrous* Churches into a portion? with Christ's true Church." (p. 13.) To speak of the Roman as an *idolatrous Church*, would seem to imply that all its members must be idolaters, which I am not prepared to affirm. *Romanism*, however, i. e. the *more popular* system of religion in the Roman Church, is superstitious and idolatrous.

sion, it might easily be shewn, that there is no contradiction in those statements. An intelligent reader will easily disentangle them for himself, by remembering that I have maintained, that the Roman Church is indeed deeply *culpable* and very *corrupt* in *permitting* Idolatry to exist within her pale; and yet that, as she does not *enjoin it*, (either by the decrees of Councils or otherwise,) she is not actually *apostate or cut off from Christ*. In a word, she is still capable of REFORMATION.

In connexion with this subject I must say, that I cannot see the justice of your "demand," (p. 8.) that the expressions of those who are in authority amongst you "be interpreted *in "accordance* with your formularies." It is not impossible, that men may hold what is inconsistent with the formularies of their Church; and there is still less difficulty in supposing that their doctrines may *go beyond the wording of those formularies*, without being *opposed* to them. This is the case with Romanists. Their formularies do not (I believe) teach or enjoin Idolatry; and yet Idolatry is taught and practised. That is, Romanism is more corrupt than its own formularies.

The object of your reference (p. 14, 15.) to the former prevalence of "the Bible alone" system in this country, and to the support given to the Bible Society by some of our Prelates, is to prove, that the "Bible alone" doctrine, as *opposed* to any Church authority, is as much sanctioned amongst us, as idolatrous worship is amongst Romanists. But you are surely aware, that this doctrine is now, and has long been, *openly* condemned and resisted by the great body of the Clergy; and we have no reason to suppose that the Prelates, (always, I believe, *a minority* of the Episcopal body,) who have supported the Bible Society, intended to approve any unsound principles, or to give their countenance to any thing but the circulation of the Bible without note or comment, which is, in itself, a perfectly unexceptionable and most laudable object.

Your argument, however, in this case, concedes the validity of that by which I shewed, that Romanists are *responsible* for the idolatrous language and prayers employed by the Authorities, without any opposition or protest from the members of their Communion. And the whole pamphlet before me is a further admission of its correctness. You do not attempt to deny that the character of Romanism depends on the lawfulness of the expressions which were adduced in my first Letter.

I must pass over several minor points in the first and second sections of your "Remarks," the discussion of which would withdraw attention from the important features of this discussion. They may perhaps be noticed at the conclusion of this Letter.

§. 2. *Romanism convicted of idolatry by Dr. Wiseman's concessions.*

Let us now turn to the really serious part of the question, and examine how far you have been able to meet the charge which was made against your system—that the blessed Virgin and the Saints receive amongst Romanists "honours which are "due only to the Trinity, and which interfere with the sole "prerogatives of the Deity."

Your Reply, Sir, has only confirmed the worst apprehensions that could have been formed as to the extent of the evils under which Religion is suffering amongst you. It has shewn that the corruptions which were pointed out are deeply rooted, and widely spread in your communion. Every expression and every practice to which I referred, however idolatrous and impious, has been studiously maintained and defended. Far from disclaiming responsibility for such language, or from protesting against it, you confidently maintain its correctness in all points, and are prepared to go to *still greater lengths* than any of the writers whom I quoted; for you cite in their justification, language which is still more offensive than that which was produced. This proceeding most fully establishes the truth of what was said in my first Letter; that "you (Romanists) con-"tent yourselves with *general disclaimers* of superstition and "idolatry, but you will never venture to lay your finger on any "specific case."[c] No: so far is this from being the case, that the moment an attempt is made to point out the real and undeniable corruptions existing in your communion, they are eagerly defended and justified in their fullest exrent.

Your Reply has established another point, which is of great importance in our controversies with Romanists. It has shewn that we are not called on to enter into *any discussion* with you on the propriety of asking the Saints and Angels to "pray for "us." Such discussions may be put aside, *until* you disclaim and reject those far more objectionable and dangerous Invocations which invest the Saints with the attributes of Deity; which reduce God to the same level with His creatures, or elevate creatures to an equality with God. The mere invocation of Saints to "*pray* for us" stands on different grounds, because it distinctly recognises the superiority of God.

You have conceded then what I contended for in my first Letter, that Romanists *are responsible* for the expressions sanctioned by Authority, which were there produced.

But you concede still more than this. I contended, that the

[c] Letter I. p. 17.

blessed Virgin and the Saints receive in those authorized expressions, honours which are only due to the Deity; that the attributes of the Deity are plainly and repeatedly ascribed to created beings. THIS YOU HAVE NOT ATTEMPTED TO DENY. You have not answered the arguments which were adduced to prove, that the very powers and attributes ascribed in those passages to the Saints, belong, according to Revelation, to God only. You have only adduced a series of *precedents* for such prayers from various writers. I have a right therefore to assume, that you cannot deny the validity of my proofs; and thus my conclusion remains established; that the Virgin Mary and the Saints receive amongst you honours which are due to God; and that your prayers invest them with the attributes of Deity.

Now, Sir, according to yourself, "*Idolatry* is the giving to "man or to any thing created, that *homage*, that *adoration*, "and that *worship* which God hath reserved unto himself,"[d] and you acknowledge, that "throughout God's word, the crime of "idolatry is spoken of as the most heinous, the most odious, and "the most detestable in his eyes."[e] Have I not a right then to claim you as a witness against the prayers which you have defended? Have I not a right to produce your own confessions as amongst the strongest possible condemnations of what is so generally practised amongst Romanists, and practised without a word of warning, of censure, or of opposition?

Romanists allege, that all these acts of homage and adoration to the Virgin and the Saints cannot be in reality idolatrous;—cannot trench on the worship due to the Creator; because they *believe* that God is infinitely superior to the Saints; and hence they conclude, that He will regard all worship of the Saints, however apparently idolatrous, as in reality consistent with, and subordinate to, that which is due to Himself.

But how can you be *certain* of this? How can you be *assured* that the Divine Justice of a "jealous God."[f] will so easily excuse actions which to all appearance despoil Him of his glory in the face of the world? Can it be consistent with the will of God, that his professed disciples should commit even *external idolatry?* Is it fitting that they should seem to the world idolaters—and that the Heathen should be able to adduce their example to justify themselves in worshipping more than one God? Is it Christian to make use of forms which must, almost irresistibly, tempt the unlearned to commit idolatry in the worst

[d] Lectures on the principal doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church, vol. ii. p. 93.

[e] Ibid.

[f] Exodus xx. 5.

sense? Surely, Sir, if such addresses are, in their plain and obvious sense, idolatrous and if they inevitably lead to the grossest forms of idolatry, there can be no reason to suppose that God will pardon those who employ and sanction them, or those whose especial duty it is to watch against idolatry, and who yet utter no word of admonition or reproof to the people entrusted to their care.

Is it right that Christians should offer honours to the Saints which are even *apparently and externally idolatrous?* There cannot be any doubt of its impropriety. Consider for a moment the object of all external worship addressed to God. We worship God in order to glorify Him before men and angels,—in order to testify that He is, as we *believe*, All-powerful, All wise, and All-merciful. It is, to shew forth to his glory, the inward convictions of our hearts. If then we divide that worship with others, we do not accomplish the objects of our worship. We do not so much raise others to an equality with God, as bring down God to a level with his creatures. If the *external worship* due to God be imparted also to creatures, God is not honoured: He is even insulted and offended.

Consider the anger of God against Moses, when his language at the water of Meribah implied that he could bring water out of the rock by his own power. God said to Moses and Aaron, "because ye believe me not, to *sanctify me in the eyes of the "children of Israel*, therefore ye shall not bring this congrega- "tion into the land which I have given them."[g] Consider the rebuke and the punishment administered to Sennacherib for his impious boasting, "I have digged and drunk strange waters, "&c." "Hast thou not heard long ago," saith the Lord, "how I have done it, and of ancient times that I have formed "it?"[h] Think also of the awful instance of God's displeasure, when Herod did not refuse the divine honours which the people of Tyre and Sydon paid him. "The angel of the Lord "smote him, because he gave not God the glory; and he was "eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost."[i] These instances, to which many others might be added, go to establish the conclusion, that God will visit with his severest displeasure those, who, in any way, attribute to creatures those powers, or offer to them that homage, which is due to the Creator.

It is not merely our belief or our intention which God requires to be sound and pure, but our external profession of faith also, "for with the heart of man believeth unto righteousness; "and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."[k] If

[g] Numbers xx. 12.
[h] 2 Kings xix. 24, 25, &c.
[i] Acts xi. 23.
[k] Rom. x. 10.

therefore the external profession of our faith in *prayer* and *worship* be unsound; if it ascribe divine power to creatures; the mere inward persuasion of our hearts will not suffice for our salvation. If we are *externally* idolaters, we shall not be saved from punishment, by believing that there is but one God.

If these principles be not adopted, you could not offer any opposition to the introduction of professions of faith, which, I believe, would be scarcely acceptable even to Romanists. For if it be allowable in prayer, which is a profession of faith, to offer the Virgin and the Saints the same homage, and ascribe to them the same attributes, as we do to God, there cannot be any objection to introduce them into a creed, which is only a profession of faith in a different form. Suppose then, that Gregory XVI. were to substitute a new profession instead of that of Pius IV. (which is a *possible* case); and that after the Nicene Creed the following passage were inserted:

"And I believe in the Virgin Mary, the 'only refuge' of "sinners, by whom 'the world is freed,' whose name is of "'salvation to the baptized.' I acknowledged that from her "'celestial inspiration' good counsels proceed. I believe that "she can do whatever she wills; and I adore and worship her, "with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as my sa-"viour, my deliverer, and my sovereign. I believe also in the "Saints and Angels, in whom my whole confidence is placed. "I offer to them my heart and soul, and I worship and glorify "them, with the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost, and the "Virgin Mary."

Now, Sir, there is nothing in this profession of faith which would be inconsistent with the principles of your Letter. It might be defended by exactly the same arguments which Romanists employ to excuse the prayers which I quoted in my first Letter. It would be easy to say, that, after all, the *belief* of the Roman Church was quite sound; that you rejected with *horror* the notion of idolatry; and that you did not *imagine*, that the Virgin or the Saints could do any thing for you except by their prayers. On your principles no opposition could be made to such a profession of faith. You could only object to it on the very principles on which we object to your actual language to the Virgin and Saints. You could only say, that such a profession would be, *in its obvious meaning*, idolatrous; that it was calculated to cause the grossest idolatry; and that the external worship and the professions of Christians ought always to be in accordance with their faith.

This is what we contend for. We contend that it can never be lawful for Christians to use an idolatrous external worship,

and that there is no reason to believe that God will excuse such worship, because *faith* is alleged to be sound.

Let us suppose a petitioner, on entering the presence of his *earthly* Sovereign, to fall down before some *fellow-subject;* to profess his *allegiance* to that subject; to offer him all the honours due to the sovereign; and to solicit from him favours which no subject can bestow. What would be the feelings of that earthly sovereign, thus dishonoured in his own presence? Or even suppose the petitioner to address his homage *equally* at the *same moment* to the sovereign and one of his subjects. Suppose him to couple their names in his petition, and to express equal hope and confidence in the power of each; and to solicit favours from both at once in the same form of words. Would not this be an act of disrespect to the sovereign? Would it be regarded as any thing less than insanity in the petitioner? Would it be sufficient to say, "that there was no "*intention* to place the sovereign and his subject on the same "level, or to offer them an equal degree of honour; but that it "was only meant to ask for the prayers and interest of the sub-"ject?" The reply would be, "Why then did not your con-"duct accord with your intentions? Why did you not practi-"cally make the distinctions which you acknowledge theoreti-"cally ought to be made?" Transfer this example to the parallel case of your adoration of the Virgin and Saints, and it may suggest a salutary warning.

§. 3. *Value of Dr. Wiseman's Defence. His quotations from spurious and apocryphal writings.*

I now come to your Defence of the expressions on which my first Letter commented. It consists in an appeal to Christian Antiquity, with a view to shew that language of the same kind had been employed by the early Fathers. Now, Sir, much as the testimony of Catholic Antiquity is to be valued, you must permit me to say, that we are not bound to approve of every expression which particular writers may have employed in rhetorical compositions. Romanists have no scruple themselves in exercising a reasonable criticism in such cases;[1] and if therefore

[1] See Melchior Canus, De locis Theologicis, l. vii c. iii; Tournley, De Deo, t. i. p. 181; Delahogue, De Ecclesia, p. 436. St. Augustine says "Neque quorumlibet disputationes quamvis Catholicorum et laudatorum hominum, velut Scripturas Canonicas habere debemus, ut nobis non liceat salvâ honorificentiâ quæ illis debetur hominibus, aliquid in eorum scriptis improbare et respuere, si fortè invenerimus quod aliter senserint quàm veritas habet, divino adjutorio vel ab aliis intellecta, vel à nobis. Talis ego sum in scriptis aliorum, tales volo esse intellectores meorum." August. Epist. 147. al. 111. ad Fortunatianum Siccensem Episcopum, c. 4. t. ii. p. 502.

you had been able to produce exaggerated language from some of the Fathers which approximated to that used by Romanists in their prayers to the Saints, it would not follow that this indiscretion on the part of some pious and holy men, could in any degree justify you for systematically, soberly, and of set purpose, employing language in itself idolatrous. But, Sir, I *most positively deny*, that Christian Antiquity furnishes any instances of prayers or declarations like those which were adduced in my first Letter. I say this, after having perused and examined the *apparently* imposing mass of authorities which you have produced. I say "*apparently*;" because I was not prepared to find, that a large proportion of these passages which you have quoted as from the Fathers, *including all those on which you lay the most stress*, are derived from *apocryphal* and *spurious* writings; from works written *centuries* after the time of the Fathers to whom you attribute them; from the writings of *heretics* falsely attributed to the Fathers! Page after page of quotations, garnished with many an ingenious remark, and many a grave admonition, with your applause of the *venerable* authors, and your contrasts between their sentiments and mine, are derived from works, the genuineness of which is disputed or denied by the ablest critics, even of your own communion! It is really impossible to refrain from a smile, when, after indulging in *masses* of quotations of this kind, you deal so *leniently* with a vanquished opponent, to say, "I cannot persuade myself "that he would have selected such phrases . . had he been "aware, or, at least, had he remembered, that they were so "nearly—indeed quite—identical with those that are found in "their (the Fathers') writings."[m] I must confess that I was *not* aware of this fact, and notwithstanding your labours, I still remain in my ignorance. I have not been occupied in the same "pleasing task" to which you allude at the close of your Letter. The "*pure* sources of ecclesiastical learning" from which you have been "refreshing your mind,"[n] do not seem to me exactly to merit *that* title.

But I proceed to substantiate the truth of the above statement, by noticing the various passages which you have produced from spurious or doubtful compositions.

You cite (p. 20.) a prayer of St. Ephrem Syrus, contained in the third volume of his works edited by Assemani at Rome in 1746. This prayer, together with a great body of similar prayers, from which you quote *largely*, appeared for the first

[m] Remarks, p. 66. [n] Ib. p. 86.

time in this edition of Ephrem Syrus,[o] having been unknown to all former editors of his works. Now we find from Assemani's preface, that all these prayers are copied from a manuscript in the Vatican Library (of *what age* it does not appear), which consists of a collection of prayers made by some monk named Thecaras; and in this collection, the prayers above mentioned are attributed to Ephrem.[p] So that the evidence for their genuineness depends on the veracity of this monk, of whom we know nothing, and who may perhaps have been a *fictitious* personage, or may have forged these prayers in the sixteenth or seventeenth century, for any thing that we know to the contrary. This is the evidence for their genuineness. On the other hand, we find that one or two *similar* prayers in the former editions of St. Ephrem, containing equally exaggerated expressions in honour of the blessed Virgin, are rejected by Tillemont,[q] Ceillier,[r] Oudinus,[s] and Cave,[t] as altogether unworthy of this holy man, and inconsistent with the spirit of the age in which he lived.

You cite (p. 22.) a passage from the first homily "In Dormi-"tione B. Mariæ,"[u] attributed to John Damascenus. Ceillier has observed, that this homily contains statements which are not consistent with the genuine sentiments of its reputed author.[x] And Oudinus remarks, that the Festival on which these homilies were delivered, was not instituted till a century after the death of Damascenus; and that the homilies themselves are attributed by some manuscripts to Andrew, Bishop of Cæsarea in the *ninth* century, by others to Germanus Bishop of Constantinople in the *thirteenth* century.[y] The next three quotations (p. 22, 23.) are from a homily "In Annunciatione," ascribed also to Damascenus. It appears from Ceillier, that Leo

[o] Ephrem Syri Opera, Græc. Lat. t. iii. p. 524—552.

[p] "Precationes Ephræmo tributæ, aliæ ad Deum sunt, aliæ ad B. "Virginem Deiparam, aliæ ad Sanctos . . separatim habentur . . "præsertim in collectione precum, quas Thecarus quidem mona-"chus congessit. De hoc Thecara in cod. MS. Græco Coisliniano "... sic legitur . . 'Sanctissimi Monachi Thecaræ orationes com-"punctoriæ, collectæ ex divina Scriptura, utplurimum autem ex "Sancto Ephræm.' . . . Suppresso Thecaræ nomine, extant in cod. "Vat. 1190. à fol. 1117. suntque a nobis editæ hoc t. iii. p. 492." Ephrem Syri Opera, t. iii. p. 1iii.

[q] Tillemont, Histoire Ecclesiastique, t. viii. p. 757.

[r] Ceillier, Hist. Gen. des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques, t. viii. p. 65, 66. ed. Paris, 1740.

[s] Casimiri Oudini Comment. de Script. Eccl. t. i. p. 506.

[t] Cave, Hist. Literaria, t. ii. p. 238.

[u] Opera, Ed. Lequien, t. ii. p. 859.

[x] Ceillier, t. xviii. p. 15.

[y] Oudinus, *ubi supra*, p. 1782.

Allatius believes this homily to have been composed by Theodore Studites the *younger*.[z] When this writer lived, I cannot at this moment discover, but the *elder* Theodore flourished in the *ninth* century, nearly a hundred years after the time of Damascenus. Ceillier observes, that there are passages in the homilies on the Annunciation, "which do not correspond with "the modesty and gravity of this Father."[a]

At p. 23, you extract three more passages from the same collection of prayers attributed to Ephrem Syrus by the monk Thecaras, of which I have spoken before.

In pages 26, and 27, we have various extracts from the Acts of St. Mary of Egypt, which are introduced with a statement, that "the Bollandists have *proved* that her conversion took "place about the year 383, and that the *Acts* themselves can-"not have been composed later than 500." On referring to the preface of the Bollandists, we find first, that the *Greeks* suppose that Sophonius, Patriarch of Jerusalem in the *eighth* century, was the Author of these Acts;[b] and that the Bollandists themselves admit, that there is nothing in their own argument, which obliges us to place the history of Mary in the fourth or even the *fifth* century.[c] It is true they assert that the life of Mary was known in the West in the *sixth* century.[d] The only proof which is brought for this, is an extract from some manuscript, (of what age or authority is uncertain,) in which Mary of Egypt is indeed mentioned, but without any allusion to the *Acts*, as far as I can see. So that there is no evidence for the autiquity of the *Acts*, or of the passages quoted from them.

You produce (p. 28, 29, 30.) very long extracts from the Poem entitled "Christus Patiens" attributed to St. Gregory Nazianzen. Natalis Alexander, one of your most eminent writers, denies its genuineness, and states that the most learned critics generally attribute it to Apollinaris of Laodicea—a heretic! Ceillier observes, that it is rejected as a spurious composition by Tillemont, Dupin, Baillet, Baronius, Rivetus, Vossius, Bellarmine, and Labbe.[f] He is of opinion that it may have been composed by another Gregory, who lived in the latter part of the sixth century. The Benedictine editors suspect it to be later than the ninth century.

[z] Ceillier, t. xviii. p. 149. [a] Ib. p. 150.
[b] Acta Sanctorum, tom. i. April, p. 69. [c] Ib. p. 68.
[d] Ib. p. 71. [e] Natalis Alexander, Hist. Eccl. t. iv. p. 147.
[f] Ceillier, His. Gen. &c. t. vii p. 196. See also, Oudinus Comment. de Script. Eccl. t. i. p. 644, &c.; Cave, Hist. Literaria, t. i. p. 248.

We are next favoured (p. 30, 31.)with long extracts from a Sermon attributed to St. Methodius, bishop of Pataræ. This Sermon is rejected as spurious by Ceillier, who states, that the Feast of the Purification, on which it was delivered, was not instituted till A. D. 527, and that the style is unlike that of Methodius.[f] It is also rejected by the learned Jesuit Gretser,[g] by Canisius,[h] Oudinus,[i] and Cave. Gretser, Oudinus, and Cave, suppose it to have been written by Methodius, patriarch of Constantinople, in the *ninth* century. At p. 35, 36. you indulge again in quotations from the same spurious homily of Methodius.

The Apocryphal prayers of Ephrem Syrus by Thecaras, already alluded to, are cited again, p. 41, 42.

You have hinted that I could hardly have been acquainted with the language of the Fathers, when I ventured to reprove that of Romanists towards the Virgin and the Saints. I must be allowed in return to express my surprise, that one who is fully qualified to examine into the genuineness of writings ascribed to the Fathers, and who is evidently acquainted with their real works, should have rested the *whole strength* of his defence on productions, which are, at the very first sight, suspicious; and which the slightest enquiry would have rejected as valueless. I must say that such a mode of defence is worthy of the cause in which it is employed.

§. 4. *Dr. Wiseman's Defence of the Worship of the Virgin.*

Having thus disposed of the quotations from spurious, doubtful, and apocryphal writings, which cannot be brought in proof of any doctrine, let us next proceed to enquire how far the remainder of your citations justify the language to which objections were offered in my first Letter. I fear that this discussion of particular passages will be rather too heavy a tax on the attention of the Reader; but as I am unwilling to leave any part of your defence unexamined, I must only request him to pass on to section 5, when he has been satisfied of the inadequacy of your proofs.

I. The first passage you defend is the following.

"That she [the blessed Virgin] may propitiously assist us "while we write, and by her *celestial inspiration* may *guide* "*us to such counsels* as may be most salutary to the Christian "Church." Encyclical Letter.

[f] Ceillier, tom. iv. p. 35, 36.
[g] Fabricii Bibliotheca Græca, t. vii. p. 268. ed. Harles, 1801.
[h] See Cave, Hist. Lit. t. i. p. 152.
[i] Oudinus, De Script. Eccl. t. i. p. 303, 304, 305, proves its spuriousness by several very convincing arguments.

I remarked that this passage distinctly invests the Virgin with the attributes of Deity, and you do not deny that it does. In proof of its lawfulness, however, a *spurious* prayer of St. Ephrem is cited, (p. 20.) and also a passage from his genuine writings. The latter is wholly unavailing for your purpose. St. Ephrem was speaking of the Incarnation of our Lord, on which he remarks, that God "like a *husbandman*, grafted the Godhead [of his Son] into the [human] nature of the Virgin;" after which he continues, in the words quoted by you, "Mary "*was* therefore to the Father a plant, to the Son a mother, and "to men a fountain of the eternal Spirit and the dawn of in-"corruption."[k] She *was* so, by becoming the mother of our Lord; for had not our Lord been born, we should have remained in condemnation; but this is widely different from saying, that she *is* "a fountain of the eternal Spirit," or that she herself *inspires* good counsels.

Your next extract (p. 21.) is from Ildephonsus, bishop of Toledo, in the latter part of the *seventh* century. This is certainly not an *early* testimony; nor does it proceed from an author of much note. It is however entirely free from the guilt of ascribing the Divine attributes to a creature. Ildephonsus says, "I "entreat thee, that I may have *the Spirit of thy Lord, the* "*Spirit of thy Son*."[l] This is perfectly unlike the language of the Encyclical Letter. In the one case the Spirit of God is prayed for: in the other the Virgin is invested with the attributes of that Spirit.

These, Sir, are all the passages which you have been able to produce in justification of the Encyclical Letter, and I think it may be fairly said, that they are wholly insufficient. You *allude* indeed (p. 21.) to prayers quoted in another part of your pamphlet; but I have in vain looked for any expressions like those which you here defend. My conclusion then remains undisturbed; that the blessed Virgin receives amongst you honours which are only due to the Trinity, and that she is practically invested with the attributes of God.

II. The next passages you undertake to defend are as follows.

"That She, whom we have acknowledged as our patroness "and *deliverer* amongst the greatest calamities, may &c."—Encyclical.

"We fly to thy *protection*, holy Mother of God, *despise not* —Prayer before the Litany of Loreto.

"*our prayers* . . . . but deliver us, *at all times, from all evils*."

[k] Ephræmi Syri Opera, Græc. Lat. t. iii. p. 527. ed. Assemani.
[l] Ildephonsus Tolet. de perp. Virgin. S. Mariæ, Opera P. P. Toletanorum, Madrid, 1782. p. 110.

"Condescend to permit me to praise thee, sacred Virgin: "*Grant me strength against thine enemies.*"—Prayer approved by Pius VI.

I produce some texts to shew, that the same confidence is here expressed in the Virgin as Scripture teaches us to repose in God. You reply first, by quoting from homilies of Damascenus, and prayers of St. Ephrem, which are rejected by the best critics as doubtful or spurious.[m] You next remark, that "nothing is more common than to find the Fathers thus attributing to the blessed Virgin directly, what must primarily come "from God. Thus St. Amphilochius . . . . tells us, that 'the "world is freed by a Virgin, which before by a Virgin (Eve) "had fallen under sin.' "[n] The language of this Father might be more accurately translated: "The world *was* freed *through* a "Virgin" (κεκευθέρωται κόσμος διὰ παρθένου); that is, by *our Saviour being born of the Virgin Mary*, she was an *instrumental* cause of our salvation. How different is this from saying, that the Virgin *is* the deliverer of mankind, or from acknowledging her power to "deliver us at all times from all evils." The language of Amphilochius is that of every Catholic: it is entirely free from the semblance of idolatry.

It would certainly be easy to "fill pages with quotations" of a similar character from the older writers, from St. Irenæus downwards; (p. 24.) but they would not be of any use to you. Sedulius,[o] whom you quote, as a specimen of the rest, distinctly teaches what Amphilochius did—that the Virgin *was* an instrumental means of our salvation, by becoming the mother of Christ our Lord. The language of Chrysologus which you next cite, can bear no other interpretation;[p] and the rhetorical

[m] See above, §. 3.

[n] Gallandii Bibliotheca Patrum, t. vi. p. 465.

[o] The two first verses of the quotation from Sedulius, refer to our Lord, not to the Virgin.

Unius ob meritum cuncti periere minores,
Salvantur cuncti unius ob meritum.
(Sedulii Opera, ed. Arevalo, p. 361.)

[p] The whole passage is as follows. It occurs in a homily on the generation of Christ, and the object is to shew, that "Maria" was a fitting name for the mother of our Lord, because it *preceded* salvation. "And that 'Maria' might always *go before* the salvation of "men, it preceded with songs the people whom the regenerating "water brought into light. 'Maria,' (Miriam) he saith, 'the "sister of Aaron took a cymbal in her hand, saying, Let us sing to "the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously.' This name, which "was salutary to the regenerate, a sign of virginity, the grace of "modesty, a sign of chastity, a sacrifice of God, the virtue of hospitality, an assemblage of holiness, was like a prophecy: justly "therefore was this the maternal name of the Mother of Christ." Petrus Chrysologus, Sermo cxlvi. Bibl. Patr.

expressions, taken from an oration of St. Cyril of Alexandria, which succeed them, are based on the same doctrine throughout. The oration consists almost entirely of a series of addresses in the same style; for instance, near the beginning, he says, "Hail, city of Ephesus, more than 'sea-beholding,' because, "instead of earthly havens, angelical and heavenly havens "[the bishops there met to protect the Christian faith against "Nestorius] have come to thee! Hail, glory of the Asiatic "government, for as thou art surrounded with precious temples "of the Saints like pearls, so now art thou hallowed by being "trod by many holy Fathers and Patriarchs! &c."[q] In the same rhetorical strain he afterwards addresses the Virgin, in the words you have quoted; but the doctrine conveyed by those words is perfectly sound,—that Mary was an *instrumental* cause in the work of salvation, and in all that has happened in consequence, by being made the mother of our Lord.

Venantius Fortunatus, whom you next cite, teaches exactly the same doctrine.[r] The second verse of the distich distinctly carries its own interpretation.

Ad cælos *facta es* sors, via, porta, rota.

"Thou *wast made* the way and gate to Heaven," refers evidently to her share in the incarnation of our Lord. It is in the same view, that he poetically entitles her "his hope of pardon, since she *carries the Help of earth*;" i. e. he supposes himself to address her before the birth of our Lord, an event on which all his hopes depend.

In all this, Sir, there is nothing whatever to which we can object. It has not the slightest tinge of idolatry or of superstition.

You next state, that "St. Ildephonsus seems to go even fur- "ther than the rest, and to consider, that without *devotion* to "her, there can *hardly* be hope of salvation." (p. 26.) I cannot think that you have perused the work from which you quote, or you would have seen that Ildelphonsus goes *further* than even you have stated, and really means, that without what you here call "devotion" to the Virgin, but which might more

[q] Cyril Alexandr. Opera, ed. Aubert. t. v. pars ii. p. 379.

[r] The first passage quoted in the notes, p. 25, where the Virgin is spoken of as "the *help* of earth," is explained fully by the context:

O Virgo insignis, benedicta ad gaudia nata,
Auxilium terræ, fulgor honorque poli,
Ecce *tuus florens uterus* quæ præstitit orbi,
Te generante, fidenos paradisus habet.
Venant. Fortun. de Laud. Virg. Mariæ.

properly be termed "sound faith," it *is impossible to be saved*. And in this sentiment of Ildephonsus, *we most heartily agree*. He was arguing with a *Jew* who denied the Virginity of the Mother, and consequently denied that Jesus was the Messiah. It is to this unbeliever that he uses the language cited by you, after which he adds, "Come, let us confess, I the sins and "ignorance of my youth: you the sins of your *sacrilege* and "*wickedness*, lest the heavens reveal their indignation."[s] The object was to urge the necessity of believing the Virginity of Mary; not to express confidence in her power.

The Acts of St. Mary of Egypt, to which you next appeal (p. 26), have been already considered;[t] and it has been shewn that there is no evidence for their antiquity.

The words of St. Gregory Nazianzen which you cite (p. 28) are immediately preceded by the following passage. "Des- "pairing of all remedies, she (Justina) *takes refuge with God*, "and makes her *Spouse* her *protector* against this detestable "desire; who delivered Susanna, saved Thecla, &c. . . . Who "is this but *Christ*, who rebukes the spirits, lifteth up them "that are sinking, walketh on the sea, &c." Then follow the words cited by you; "Remembering these and many more "[instances of *Christ's* power], and beseeching the Virgin "Mary to *aid* a virgin in danger,"[u] &c.

I would observe on the preceding passage, that it is conceived in such terms, "beseeching the Virgin Mary to aid," &c. that we cannot determine the *form* of prayer used. Justina may have employed a perfectly unexceptionable *form* of address to the Virgin. It may have been a mere request for the Virgin's *prayers*.[x] Therefore this passage does not touch on the question between us; which is not, whether all addresses to the Virgin are unlawful; but whether it is right to invest her with the attributes of Deity. The passage, however, distinctly shews, that the whole confidence and reliance of Justina were fixed on *God* and *Christ*, while she merely sought the "aid" of

[s] Ildephonsus, ap. Petres Tolet. Madrid. 1782. tom. i. p. 122.

[t] §. 3.

[u] Gregorii Nazianz. Opera, tom. i. p. 279. Par. 1609.

[x] Critics have remarked, that the Homily on St. Cyprian from which the above extract is taken, seems to have been composed from some very inaccurate traditions, probably derived from the monks. It confounds the lives of two Saints of the same name; one of whom was Bishop of Carthage, while the other was of the Eastern Church. We cannot depend then on the historical correctness of this Homily, and the petition of Justina to the *Virgin* was most probably added by *recent* oral tradition. You need not suppose therefore (see p. 28) that Justina, who died in 304, offered any such petition.

the Virgin, as we ourselves might seek the "aid" of a fellow creature in moments of difficulty.

I shall not here enter on the question of the propriety of asking for the prayers of the Saints—a practice, of which the *first* examples are found in the writings of Gregory Nazianzen.[y] The *abuses* which naturally flow from this practice, and of which the Romish prayers under consideration afford so melancholy an illustration, are in themselves perfectly sufficient to shew the wisdom of our Catholic and Apostolic Churches, in discontinuing the Invocation of Saints; and the Roman Church herself does not consider such invocations necessary.[z]

You produce long extracts from St. Gregory Nazianzen, and from Methodius (p. 28—31); but, as I have already shewn,[a] they are derived from *spurious* compositions.

Having now disposed of all your arguments in defence of the declarations and prayers under consideration, I may again be permitted to say, that you have not been able to produce any justification of them from the language of antiquity; and therefore my conclusion remains untouched, and even strengthened, —that the Virgin Mary receives amongst you honours which are only due to God.

III. You next undertake to defend the expressions of Cardinal Bona in his prayer to the Virgin; and here it may be remarked, that no notice has been taken in your pamphlet of some of the most objectionable parts of that prayer, in which the attributes of God are most broadly ascribed to the blessed Virgin; such as the following: "Place me near unto thee, and protect me "from all my enemies visible or invisible. *Say unto my soul,* "I AM THY SALVATION. Direct me thy servant in all my ways "and actions. Console me in all my griefs and afflictions. "Defend and preserve me from all evils and dangers. Turn "thy face unto me when the end of my life shall come; and may "*thy consolation* in that tremendous hour rejoice my spirit,[b]" &c. Surely these are exactly the terms in which we should

[y] It may be observed, that Nazianzen, when he addressed the departed in his oration, sometimes expressed doubts whether they could hear him. Thus in his Homily on Gorgonia, he says, "*If* "*thou hast any care of the things done by us,* &c. . . . . receive this "oration of ours instead of many and before many funeral obsequies."

[z] "The Council of Trent barely teaches that it is *good and profita-* "*ble* to invoke the prayers of the Saints; hence our divines infer, "that there is no positive law of the Church, incumbent on all her "children, to pray to the Saints." Milner, End of Controversy, Letter xxxiii.

[a] See §. 3.

[b] Letter I. p. 18.

address God—indeed they are the language actually employed far that purpose in holy Scripture; e. g. "Deliver me from "mine enemies, O my God." (Ps. lix. 1.) "Stop the way "against them that persecute me: say unto my soul, I am thy "salvation." (Ps. xxxv. 3.) "O that my ways were directed "to keep thy statutes." (Ps. cxix. 5.) "Let, I pray thee, thy "merciful kindness be for my comfort." (Ps. cxix. 76.) "Preserve my life from fear of the enemy." (Ps. lxiv. 1.) "Turn "us again, O God of hosts, and cause thy face to shine; and "we shall be saved." (Ps. lxxx. 7.)

But I turn to the passage which you have selected for defence. It is as follows:

"Behold, I fall down before thee, most gracious Virgin, I "fall down and worship IN THEE thy Son."

You boldly deny this passage to be idolatrous, and your proof is, "The Blessed Virgin is constantly called by the Fathers "the *Temple* of God, consequently the place in which He is "to be worshipped." (p. 33) We are accordingly favoured with long quotations from Chrysologus, Ephrem Syrus, Cyril of Alexandria, Damascenus, Sedulius, Maximus Taurinensis, and a *spurious* passage from Methodius.[c] We fully allow the doctrine taught by all these Fathers. The blessed Virgin did, most undoubtedly, become the Temple of the Godhead, by conceiving our Lord Jesus Christ: but, Sir, do you mean to say, that *she is still the Temple of the Godhead in this sense?* No: she ceased to be so, when our Saviour was born. I can produce higher authorities than you have cited, to prove that *every believer* is a temple of God. St. Paul says, "Know ye not that "ye are the *temple* of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth "in you?" (1 Cor. iii. 16.) "Know ye not that your body "is the *temple* of the Holy Ghost which is in you?" (1 Cor. vi. 19.) And yet, what would you think of saying to any living man, "Behold, *I fall down before thee; I fall down and* "*worship* IN THEE *thy God?*" Observe that the language of Bona is not, "I worship *thy Son*, who dwelleth in thee as in a "temple;" but, "I worship IN THEE, thy Son;" i. e. "In "worshipping THEE, I worship thy Son."

In a note (p. 36.) you produce a passage from St. Ephrem Syrus, to prove that the mere *type* of our Lord may be worshipped in a *third* person! I really do not profess to understand the meaning of this. The whole passage, as translated from the Syriac by Assemani, is as follows. "The Year also, "parent of all the months and days, with all the hours and

[c] pp. 33—36.

"moments which depend on it, adored [Christ] the Conqueror "of death, by its child April [the month in which our Lord "suffered]; like as Rachel through Jacob worshipped [her "child] Joseph, whom, as a type of the Son of God, the Sun "and Moon, the rulers of the year, adored."[d] The allusion is to Joseph's Dream,[e] in which the Sun and Moon, representing his father and mother, did obeisance to him; and it is here introduced to illustrate the highly figurative language in reference to the Year. Assuredly St. Ephrem did not mean that Rachel or Jacob *really* and *literally* adored Joseph: he only alludes to a dream.

Your Justification of Cardinal Bona having thus entirely failed, my conclusion remains unshaken,—that the Virgin receives amongst you honours which are only due to God.

IV. The next prayers which you undertake to defend are as follows.

"Jesus, Joseph, and Mary, I offer to you my heart and my "soul—Jesus, Joseph, and Mary, assist me in my last agony— "Jesus, Joseph, and Mary, may my soul expire in peace with "you." Prayer approved by Pius VI.

"O holy Joseph . . . . I beseech and pray thee, by both these "dear pledges, Jesus and Mary . . . . to make me ever most "chastely to serve Jesus and Mary, &c." Approved by Pius VII.

You do not understand (p. 37.) what is meant by my observation, that our Lord is made a sort of *Mediator* between Joseph and his worshippers, in this latter prayer. The term perhaps did not fully express my meaning, which was, that Joseph is here invoked to have mercy on us *for the sake of Christ*, i. e. just in the same way in which we should approach the Father. We should beseech Him "by his dear Son," to make us serve Him. Here the same form of supplication is addressed to Joseph.

Let us now turn to your defence of the prayers before us.

(1) You enquire first: "Does the union of creatures with "God, in the same *address* or *act of homage*, imply their equal- "ity in the mind of him who makes it?" (p. 37.) I answer, that it certainly does: unless there be some accompanying circumstance which implies that a difference is made.

You appeal to expressions of Terence and Horace (p. 37.); but they are not "addresses" or "acts of homage," and therefore do not affect the question. You refer to the language of Scripture (1 Chron. xxix. 20, 21.) "And David said to all the con- "gregation, Now bless the Lord your God. And all the congre- "gation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down

[d] Ephræm Syri Opera, Syriaco-Lat. t. iii. p. 604.
[e] Genesis xxxvii. 9, 10.

"their heads, and *worshipped the Lord and the King*. And "they offered sacrifices unto the Lord, and offered burnt-offer-"ings unto the Lord." Here you will observe, that their thanksgivings, prayers, sacrifices, were directed entirely to *God;* therefore no one could imagine, that the act of bowing down their heads to worship the Lord and the King, (if both were worshipped in the same act, which may not have been the case,) could have been intended to express the same homage to each.

You observe (p. 37.) that our Lord is said to have increased "in favour with *God* and *man*." This furnishes no excuse for praying to God and man as if they had the same power. The language of the prodigal (p. 37.) to his *Father*, "I have "sinned against heaven and before thee," does not justify you in addressing your prayers *in common* to God and man, as if they were *equally* the objects of faith and confidence.

The inscriptions which you next produce (p. 38.) in illustration of "the practice of the *early* Church." will not assist you.

The first is accompanied by the following remark.

"Muratori considers this inscription of the fifth or [early part "of the] sixth century." (p. 38.) On referring to Muratori,[f] I find that *three* most eminent critics, including Fontanini, Archbishop of Ancyra, attribute the inscription to the *ninth* century; that a fourth (Scalabrinius) thinks it ought to be referred to the fifth or sixth century; and that Muratori himself gives *no opinion as to its date.*

The second inscription (p. 38.) appears from Muratori[g] to be of the *ninth* century.

The third inscription (p. 38, 39.) cannot be earlier than the *seventh* century, because the title of "Arcarius of the Holy "See" which occurs there, is not of more ancient date.[h] The inscription however may have been of much *later* date than the seventh century. These inscriptions then do not represent the language of the *early* Church.

The fourth inscription (p. 39.) according to you, "takes us "back to the year 383 *at least*, as this Bassus was slain before "the reign of Gratian." (p. 39.) The same inscription is adduced in your Letter to Mr. Poynder,[i] where it is again stated, that Anicius Bassus "lived about 380 years after Christ," and that, "he is mentioned in ecclesiastical history as having with "Marinianus the patrician, most calumniously accused Pope

[f] Muratori, Antiquitates Medii Ævi, tom. v. p. 358.
[g] Ibid.
[h] Du Cangii Glossarium.
[i] Wiseman, Letters to Poynder, p. 38.

"Sixtus; upon whose full justification, his goods were confis-"cated by Valentinian." There is some sad flaw in your chronology here; for Pope Sixtus was not *elected* till A. D. 432,[k] and Valentinian flourished about the same time. How therefore you can "take us back" to 383, is entirely beyond my comprehension. "Ecclesiastical history" in the form of Baronius' Annals, fixes the transaction alluded to in the year 433.[l]

As to the inscription itself, which you have produced, it can have no weight in a matter of controversy, proceeding as it did from the pen of a layman of no authority. Besides, we do not know where it was placed, or with what object. If these circumstances were known, they might aid us in judging of the propriety of the inscription. E. g. If it had been placed in a Church erected in honour of the Saints or Martyrs, it might not have been very unbecoming.

I have to make but one more observation on all these inscriptions: it is simply this. They contain no "acts of homage," no "addresses" to God and the Saints in common, and therefore they cannot justify your prayers.

You next refer (p. 40.) to the well-known passages in St. Justin Martyr, where it is said, "Him [God], and his Son who "came from him, and taught us these things, and the army "of good Angels who follow and resemble Him, and the spirits "of prophecy, we venerate and adore."[m] You are of course aware, that the ablest critics, even in the Roman Church, are much divided as to the proper translation of this passage,[n] and that many writers render it thus: "Him; and his Son who "came from Him, and taught us and the army of good angels "these things; and the Spirit," &c. But even taking it as you do, the Angels are not *really* joined "under the same form "of expression" (p. 40.) with God; for, as the Benedictine Editors remark,[o] the word "venerate" refers to the Angels,

[k] Baronius, Fleury, Hist. Eccl.

[l] Baronii Annales, t. vii. p. 460. ed. Lucæ, 1741. Ceillier rejects the whole transaction as fabulous, t. xiii. p. 240; but it appears from his account that Bassus was Consul in 431.

[m] Just. Mart. Apolog. i. p. 11. ed. Thirlby.

[n] The reader may here be referred to the valuable works of the Bishop of Lincoln on Justin Martyr, p. 53. and of Mr. Tyler on "Primative Christian Worship." p. 107—111.

[o] Σεβομεν καὶ προσκυνουμεν, colimus et adoramus Nam primum quidem ad angelos ipsos refertur, habita ratione discriminis quod inter Creatorem et rem creatam intercedit. Alterum autem nequaquam angelos necessariò comprehendit. Sæpe duo verba simul conjuncta non ad unam et eandem rem, sed ad diversas judicio legentium referuntur. Just. Mart. ed. Benedict. p. xxii.

and "adore" (προσκυνεῦμεν) to God. In another place Justin expressly says, "We *adore* (προσκυνεῦμεν) God only."[p]

Thus then it appears, that you have been unable to produce either from Scripture or Antiquity, any language which can justify Romanists in addressing at the same moment the same homage and prayers to created beings and to God.

(2) Your second question (p. 41.) is: "Can it be idolatrous "to desire or pray that the blessed Virgin and the Saints should "receive our souls when we expire, or assist us at the hour of "death?"

In proof of the lawfulness of this practice you observe that St. Ambrose says the blessed Virgin will receive virgins when they die, and present them to her Son.[q] You next refer to what St. Gregory the Great relates on the authority of a person named Probus, whose sister beheld a vision of the Virgin as she was dying, and addressed her in the words, "Behold, Lady, I "come."[r] We are next favoured with a *spurious* prayer of St. Ephrem, and with the language of Maximus in an Oration on St. Eusebius of Vercelli, in which he expresses a wish, that when we depart from this world, he may "receive us into his "abode and his bosom,"[s] as Abraham received Lazarus into his bosom. Other passages from the same writer follow, in which it is said that the Martyrs "receive us," when we go forth from the body.

All this may be more or less right, probable, or true; but I cannot see how it meets the objection offered to your prayers. The real objection which I advanced was, that Jesus, Joseph, and Mary are placed *on an equality*, by being invoked in common at the same moment, to receive our souls. This would lead one to think that they are *equal:* that they are a Trinity of some sort—that they are three Gods, or three human beings. It is no answer to this objection to say, that the saints or angels receive our souls at the hour of death.

(3) Your third question (p. 43.) is: "Does the 'serving of "Jesus and Mary' necessarily imply a *division* of service or "allegiance between them; and not a bestowing on each a dif-"ferent species of it?"

In proof that it does not, you refer to the answer to the *first* question. It has been shewn, I think, that you will not find much help in that quarter. As to the passage from Ildephonsus

p Justin. Mart. Apol. i. p. 26. ed. Thirlby.
q Ambros. de Virgin. lib. ij. c. ii.
r Gregorii Dialog. l. iv. c. xvii.
s Maximus, Hom. lxxviii.

which is adduced (p. 44.) in further proof, I need only remark, that it makes a broad distinction between the Virgin and God, "Ideo ego servus tuus, quia tuus Filius *Dominus meus*. Ideo "tu Domina mea, quia tu *ancilla Domini mei*."[t] "Thou art "my mistress, because thou art *the handmaid of my Lord*." These latter expressions you have thought proper to *omit*. In no part of the passage does Ildephonsus say, "I serve Jesus and "Mary," or use any expressions like those that have been objected to.

Such then is the result of your defence of the prayers and homage offered to the blessed Virgin by the most eminent authorities in the Roman Communion. You have not attempted to deny that they attribute Divine powers to creatures; that they solicit from them favours which God alone can bestow; that they place created beings on a level with their Creator. You have entirely failed to bring from Scripture or Tradition any instances of similar forms. I have a right therefore to reassert that they are idolatrous; that your Communion is deeply tinged with idolatrous practices; and that those idolatries are openly defended and justified by the very persons, whose office (if it was legitimately acquired) would compel them, under pain of damnation, to oppose every thing that is connected with Idolatry.

It is to the *nature* of the prayers and other honours offered by you to the Virgin that we object, so that we shall not attempt to dispute the right of the Roman Church to use such prayers *frequently* (p. 45.) if they may be used at all. There is not the slightest evidence that the primitive Church ever practised such worship. We have no reason to think that any ancient devotional works (p. 45) contained expressions like those which you employ. There is no trace of them in the ancient liturgies; none in the genuine writings of the Fathers. They only appear in the writings of heretics, in spurious and apocryphal writings, or in the figurative language of poetry.

I shall only make a few remarks on the remainder of your third section, in which a theory, which I have not time to examine, (p. 45—53.) is propounded to account for the greater veneration paid to the blessed Virgin in *later* than in earlier times. I cannot but wonder that you should appeal (p. 47.)

[t] Ildephonsus, ap. Patres. Toletanos, p. 158. ed. 1782.

to the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, in proof that "devotion "towards the martyrs began from the earliest ages." I shall reserve the passage for future consideration: it is *decisively* opposed to you. You observe (p. 52.) that "Christian monuments "of the age of the Catacombs represent the Virgin as superior "to the Apostles themselves." This is quite consistent with a sound faith, and yet it does not warrant our giving Divine honours either to one or the other. The figures to which you allude[u] may be as ancient as you imagine, but they resemble those found in manuscripts of a much later date.

In allusion to the Collyridian heresy, which elevated the blessed Virgin into a Deity, you remark, that "this foolish idol- "atry could hardly have sprung up, where no sort of venera- "tion had ever been paid." (p. 52, 53.) Very true: but who supposes that "*no sort of veneration* had ever been paid," or that *no sort* of veneration is *due?* All that we contend against, is what the Collyridian heretics practised, and what Romanists *follow them* in practising, i. e. worshipping the Virgin with Divine honours; offering to her the same homage and worship which is offered to God. How you can venture to quote the language of Epiphanius, "Let *honour* be given to Mary, but "let only Father, Son, and Holy Ghost be *adored*," (p. 53.) after having so systematically justified prayers and addresses in which the Virgin is placed on a level with the Trinity, is a matter of no small surprise to me.

§. 4. *Dr. Wiseman's Defence of Prayers to Saints.*

I have maintained that the Saints receive amongst you "hon- "ours which are only due to God,"[x] and in proof of this have cited the following passages.

"We will earnestly beseech with humble prayers from the "Prince of the Apostle Peter, and from his co-Apostle Paul, that "you may stand as a wall. Relying on this delightful hope, we "trust that the Author and Finisher of our faith, Jesus Christ, "will at length console us in all our tribulations." Encyclical.

"Jesus, Joseph, and Mary, I offer you my heart and my "soul, &c." as above, p. 22.

"Angel of God who art my guardian, *enlighten* me who am "committed to thee with heavenly piety; guard, direct, and "govern me." Approved by Pius VI.

"O holy Joseph . . . . . I beseech and pray thee . . . . . to "preserve me from all uncleanness, and make me ever most "chastely to serve Jesus and Mary." Approved by Pius VII

[u] Sedulii Opera, ed. Arevalo, p. 351. [x] Letter I. p. 14.

(1) Your first question on these prayers is as follows. "Is "it idolatrous or wrong to address or to speak of any Saints, "more especially the two great Apostles, as *protectors?*" (p. 55.)

I do not mean to say that it is idolatrous in all cases; but I do certainly think it wrong to attribute to the Apostles the *protection of the Church,* while in the very next words, we only attribute to Christ, its *consolation;* because this seems to place the Apostles on *a level* with our Saviour, to say the *least.* I think also that it is wrong to express at the same moment, in the same terms, the same confidence in God and in his creatures.

You refer to St. Basil's homily on the Forty Martyrs when he speaks in the following terms. "These are they who hav- "ing obtained a place amongst us, (their relics were deposited "in the Church of Cæsarea,) like continual towers, afford se- "curity from the incursions of the enemies."[y] That is, their memory and *example* was calculated to encourage Christians against the assaults of heresies and evil spirits. I do not see that we can deduce any thing more from this passage, or that it can justify your practice.

Your next proof is from Paulinus of Nola, who in an *epitaph,* and a *poetical* epitaph on the presbyter Clarus, desires his *prayers* for himself and his wife Therasia. The whole passage is free from any thing that looks like idolatry, and does not afford any justification of the prayers and expressions to which we object.[z] It is doubted whether the passion of Genesius was written by Paulinus of Nola, but the exhortation is to pray for the *intercession* of Genesius, "Patrocinetur" may well be translated, "plead for."[a] The next extracts from Paulinus are *poetical,* and cannot afford precedents for prayers, and solemn declarations. It was *supposed* by many persons, that the martyrs took a particular interest in those places where their relics were deposited, and honoured; and that they prayed for them. This notice, however uncertain, led to expressions of confidence in their intercession and patronage with reference to those particular places.

y οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς χώραν διακαλύοντες, οἱονεί πύργοι τινες συνεχεῖς, ἀσφάλειαν ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἐναντίων καταδρομῆς παρεχόμενοι. Basilii Opera, t. ii. p. 135. ed. Benedict.

z Sic Deus accivit, sic nos Martinus amavit
Sic et tu pariter Clare tuere pares.
Non meritis sed amore pares, tu sancte velebis
Exorare pares et meritis fieri,
Si cum Martino socia pietate *labores,*
Ut vincant vestræ crimina nostra *preces.*
Paulinus Epist. xxxii. ad Severum, ed. Muratori.

a Paulini Passio S. Genesii, p. 316.

The language of St. Prudentius (p. 56.) amounts to a wish that St. Laurence may *love* his fellow-citizens; and the same sentiment in another form, appears in his hymn on St. Eulalia. (Ibid.) But these again are *poetical* expressions, such as any Christian poet who disapproved of your prayers might still employ.

The language of Gaudentius, Venantius, Leo, Chrysostom, Maximus, (pp. 57, 58.) merely shews that those writers sometimes used the terms of "patronage" or "protection," when they alluded to the prayers of the Saints to God for men. This does not excuse you for expressing your confidence at the *same time* and in the *same manner*, in the power of God and of His creatures. It does not justify Gregory XVI. for asserting that Peter and Paul *protect* the Church, while Christ *consoles* it. It does not excuse you for "offering your hearts and souls" to "Jesus, Joseph, and Mary," instead of to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

You are right in saying that the bishop of Rome might safely repeat the homilies of St. Leo, "without disparagement to his claim of supremacy," (p. 58.); for no one was more zealous to maintain and augment the dignity of his See. The "protec-"tion" of which St. Leo speaks in the passage you have cited, refers to the *promise of Christ* that Peter's faith should not fail, Luke xxii. 21. which St. Leo uses as an encouragement to us.[b] His continual object was to represent that St. Peter still lived *in his successors*, and that all the promises made to him, were made to the bishops of Rome also.[c]

It is doubtful whether any such verses as you mention (p. 59.) were ever inscribed over the gate of Glastonbury Church; for the book of William of Malmsbury "on the Antiquities of "Glastonbury," from which they are taken, is full of fabulous narrations, supplied probably by the monks of Glastonbury.

(2) The next question is as follows: "Is it *direct prayer to* "*Saints*, for *favours which God alone can bestow*, that Mr. "Palmer so strongly reprobates in the examples last quoted? "Surely he ought to be aware that in the ancient Church such "prayers were admitted." (p. 59.)

Your citations do not prove this. St. Gregory of Nyssa states, that a person by saying, "*Holy Ephrem help* (assist) "*me*,"[d] escaped from a dangerous position. Such an expression does not interfere with the Divine attributes. It is widely different from your prayers to Saints. We may be

[b] Opera, ed. Quesnel. t. i. p. 18.
[c] Opera, t. i. p. 103, 104—106, 110, 112.
[d] Nyssen. Opera, t. iii. p. 615. ed, 1638.

"helped" by a fellow creature: but we have no right to ask from him blessings, and graces, as if he were a Divinity. The language of Gregory Nazianzen (p. 60.) is plainly rhetorical. It occurs in an Oration in praise of St. Cyprian. That of St. John Chrysostom (p. 60.) recognises throughout the *Divine power*, and supposes that the Saints can only aid us by their *prayers*. The same may be said of the succeeding quotations from Chrysostom, and Gregory of Nyssa. (p. 61.) The passage cited from Basil (p. 61.) does not seem to me to refer to any invocation of Saints. It is thus introduced: "Where two "or three are gathered together in the name of the Lord, there "is He in the midst of them. Where there are *forty* [in, "allusion to the relics of the forty Martyrs;] who doubts that "*He is present?* The afflicted takes refuge with the forty "Martyrs [i. e. in their Church]." Then follows the remainder of your quotation.[e] The meaning is, that prayers may be offered *to God* in the Church of the Martyrs, with *peculiar confidence*. The passage from St. Ambrose (p. 61, 62.) distinctly supposes that the Angels and Martyrs aid us by their *prayers*, and that they are creatures as we are.

In none of these cases were "direct prayers" offered "to "Saints, for favours which God alone can bestow."

The next passage, from St. Ambrose, is an exhortation of a pious matron to her son to devote himself entirely to God, in which she says, "There we deposited our vows whence we "took the name. The effect followed our vows: give there- "fore back to the Martyr, what thou hast received from the Mar- "tyr."[f] The meaning is, that she had offered her vows to God at the Church of the Martyr St. Laurence, and that the Martyr had "*obtained*" (p. 63.) by his prayers this child. This merely supposes that the prayers of a Martyr had great efficacy. The language in reference to Felix and Laurentius (p. 63.) is poetical, and cannot be judged with the strictness which should be applied to prose compositions. The same observation is applicable to that of S. Prudentius (p. 64.) Doubtful of his own merits, he wishes for the additional prayers of the Saint. As for the sentiments of Valerian, bishop of Cemela, we cannot attach any weight to what has been rather injudiciously said by this obscure writer, in opposition to the sentiments of the most eminent Fathers which I shall hereafter produce.

In conclusion, I will only observe, that in no one of the passages adduced by you are there any direct prayers to Saints for favours which God only can bestow: nor are the Saints addres-

[e] Basil. Homil. in XL Martyrs, t. ii. p. 155. ed. Benedict.
[f] Ambros. Exhort. Virgin. c. iij.

sed at the same time and in the same manner as God. Consequently the objections which have been offered to your prayers and language remain unanswered.

§. 5. *Romanism condemned by Catholic Antiquity.*

Having now completed the examination of your defence, and shewn that the appeal which you have made to Catholic Antiquity in justification of Romish addresses to Saints and Angels, is perfectly unavailing; it remains for me to produce the *real* sentiments of the Fathers, not derived from *spurious* or *heretical* compositions, but from their own genuine writings. It remains for me to shew, that the principles and the practice of Romanists are equally condemned by Catholic Antiquity—that they are derived from Heresies and Idolatries repudiated by the Catholic Church. You have appealed to Catholic Antiquity. Will you consent to stand or fall by its real verdict?

Which doctrine then is the most conformable to that of the primitive Church? *We* are of opinion that religious worship is due to God only, and not to any *creature* whatever, be it angel, spirit, man, beast, or inanimate creature. We *honour* and *love* Angels and Saints, because they are loved by God; but we think it wrong to offer religious worship to any being whatever but God. We hold that *prayer* ought only to be offered to God—that it is a species of *sacrifice* which is only due to the Divine nature. We think that it is unlawful to repose our hope, trust, or confidence in any creature. We think it *needless* to ask for the intercession of Saints and Angels to render us acceptable to God; and we believe that we ought ourselves boldly to approach the Throne of Grace, confiding in the intercession of Jesus Christ. We think it unlawful to unite the name of God with that of his creatures in prayer, and to offer the same acts of homage to them. The doctrines and practice of Romanists are opposed to ours on all these points. Let us then place the question before the Fathers, and ascertain their decision.

I. "Is it lawful to worship any other being but God? Is all religious worship to be offered to Him alone? And are the Saints, Angels, and other created beings, only to be loved, honoured, imitated, or regarded, as the case may be?"

The doctrine of Christian Antiquity is decisive on this point. Justin Martyr, who wrote little more that a century after the death of our Lord, in describing to the Emperor Antoninus the doctrines inculcated by our Saviour, speaks thus: "That it is "necessary to *worship God alone*, (Christ) thus persuaded us,

"saying, 'The greatest commandment is, Thou shalt worship "the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve, with all "thy heart and with all thy strength; even the Lord God who "made thee;' and when a certain person came and said to Him, "'Good Master,' He answered, saying, 'None is good save "God only, who made all things.' But they who are not found "living according to his instructions, be it known that *they are "not Christians* . . . . He answered them, saying, 'Render "therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God "the things that are God's' Wherefore *we worship God only*, "but in other respects we are gladly obedient to you." It may perhaps be said, that the restriction of all worship to *God* in this passage, had reference only to the Heathen worship of false gods or deified men, and was not intended as any denial of that worship which is due to Saints and Angels. This is a distinction entirely without foundation, because, as will be shewn, the Fathers objected in general to *the worship of any creatures whatever;* and on this one broad principle rejected equally the false Gods of the Heathen, and the idolatrous heresies of the Collyridians and Angelici. But I shall now produce a passage to which you have alluded, (p. 48.) and which is conclusive against you.

It is taken from perhaps the most beautiful monument of Christian Antiquity—I mean the Acts of the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, which were composed A. D. 167, immediately after the events which they narrate. It appears, that after the martyrdom of Polycarp, the enemies of the Christians endeavoured to prevent them from obtaining his remains. They urged the Roman Proconsul not to give up the body, "Lest, forsaking the crucified (Jesus), they should begin to "*adore* this man. And this they said by the suggestion and "aid of the *Jews*, who had watched our endeavours to remove "him from the fire, being ignorant that we can never forsake "Christ, who suffered for the salvation of those who are saved "out of all the world, *nor adore any other*. For Him, as being "the Son of God, *we worship;* but the Martyrs, as being dis-"ciples and imitators of the Lord, *we love as they deserve*, on "account of their unconquerable love to their King and Mas-"ter."[h] No words can more plainly teach our doctrine—that worship is due to God only. This is also the language of Athenagoras, a writer of the second century, "We (Christians)

[g] Justin Martyr, Apologia Prima, p. 25, 26. ed. Thirlby.
[h] Eccles. Smyrnensis Epist. de S. Polycarp. Martyr. ap. Patres Apostol. t. ii. p. 585. ed. Jacobson.

"do not approach (spiritual) powers, and *serve them;* but their "Lord and Master."[i]

St. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, and a friend of the holy Martyr Polycarp, says, that "our Lord manifestly shewed that the "Lord, who had been declared by the Law, is the true and "one God, for He whom the Law (of Moses) had announced "as God, Christ shews to be the Father, *whom alone the disci-*"*ples of Christ must serve* . . . The Law commands us to "*praise God the Creator and to serve Him only,*"[k] &c. Compare this with the prayer to St. Joseph,[l] that he will "make "us *serve* Jesus and Mary." The language of St. Theophilus of Antioch, who lived in the latter part of the second century, is equally clear. "A king," he says, "does not wish those "who are subject to him to be called kings" [i. e. to receive royal honours]. "For 'the king' is his title, and it is unlawful "for any other person to be called so. In like manner *it is* "*not lawful, to worship any but God only.*"[m] This, you will observe, is the very argument I have employed against your acts of external worship to the Virgin and Saints. An earthly king would be offended at seeing royal honours paid to his subjects: and it is unlawful to act towards God in a way which we should not dare to attempt with an earthly Sovereign.

St. Clement of Alexandria considers it a principal point of religion to "*worship* one God *alone*, who is truly omnipotent"[n] and the same doctrine is taught in various places by Tertullian.[o] Thus, in his reflections on Prayer, he remarks on the wisdom of our Lord's command "of praying in secret, by which he "... desired the lowliness of faith, that to *Him alone, whom* "*he believed to hear and to see every where, he would offer his* "*worship.*"[p] These sentiments remained with Tertullian even after he had fallen into the heresy of Montanus: "It is en-"joined me," he says in his Scorpiace, "not to call any other "being God; that I should not even in speaking, by my tongue "no less than by my hand make a God; that *I should not* "*adore, or in any manner venerate, any other* but that One "who thus commands; whom I am also commanded to *fear*, lest "I be forsaken by Him."[q]

[i] Athenagoras, Legat. pro Christianis, ap. Gallandii Bibl. Patr. ii. p. 15.

[k] Irenæus, adv. Hæres. lib. v. c. 22. ed. Benedict.

[l] See above, p 22.

[m] Theophil. Antiochen. lib. i. ad Autolycum, c. xi Gallandii Bibliotheca Patrum, t. ii. p. 84.

[n] Stromata, lib vi. t. ii. Oper. p. 825. ed. Potteri.

[o] Athenagoras, Legat. pro Christianis, *ubi supra*, p. 13.

[p] Tertullian, De Orat. p. 129. ed. Rigaltii Par. 1664.

[q] Tertull. Scorpiace, p. 490.

The language of the Fathers was always the same; St. Cyprian says, that evils are inflicted on men, "in order that the "One *God* of all, may be alone *worshipped and prayed to by* "*all.*"[r] St. Dionysius of Alexandria says, "We worship and "adore the One God and Creator of all things who entrusted "the empire to Valerian and Gallienus beloved of God.... "*We worship no other.*"[s] Such also was the language of the Martyr Fructuosus Bishop of Tarragona, (about A. D. 262.) "I *worship* one God, who made heaven and earth and all that "therein is." When his Deacon Eulogius was asked whether he would worship Fructuosus after his death, he replied, "I "worship not Fructuosus, but I worship Him whom Fructuosus "worships also."[t] Lactantius says, "No other religion and "*worship* is to be held, but that of one God."[u]

St. Athanasius supplies us with the *principle* on which the Church refused to worship any being except God. It was not merely because heathens and heretics worshipped *false* or *imaginary* Gods: it was, on this broad, plain, and most rational principle—that religious worship was unsuitable to any *creature*—that it belonged only to the Creator of all things. He argues that Christ is God because he is worshipped, for that no one except God can be worshipped. His argument is very remarkable.

"*One creature,*" he says, "*doth not worship another,* but "the servant his master, the creature his God. Whence Peter "the Apostle hindered Cornelius when he wished to worship "him, saying, 'I also am a man.' The Angel also hindered John "when he wished to worship him in the Apocalypse, saying, "'See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant, and of thy "brethren the Prophets, and of them which keep the sayings "of this book, *Worship God.*' *Therefore it belongs to God* "*only to be worshipped.* And this the Angels themselves "know, that although they excel others in glory, they are yet "all *creatures*, and are *not in the number of those who are to be* "*worshipped*, but of them who *worship the Lord.*"[x] It may be remarked here, that it would be perfectly absurd to imagine even for a moment, that Cornelius or St. John could have really intended to give *Divine honours* to Peter or the Angel. Nevertheless their worship was in each case forbidden; and according to St. Athanasius it is only due to God. And the

[r] Cyprian, ad Demetrian, p. 232. ed. Rigaltii, 1649.
[s] Eusebii Hist. Eccl. lib. vii. c. 11. p. 258. ed. Valesii.
[t] Baronii Annales, Anno 262. §. 60. t. iii. p. 126. ed. Lucæ. 1738.
[u] Lactantii Instit l. i. c. 20. ap. Galland. Bibl. Patr. iv. 245.
[x] Athanasii Orat. ii. contra Arianos, t i. p. 491. Oper. ed. Benedict.

principle on which such worship is forbidden is, that *creatures* are not to be worshipped.

This principle is also laid down by St. Gregory of Nyssa in the following terms. "That none of those things which have "their being by *creation* is to be worshipped by men the Di- "vine word hath enacted, as we may learn from almost all the "divinely-inspired Scripture. Moses, the Tables, the Law, "the Prophets afterwards, the Gospels, the doctrine of all the "Apostles, equally forbid the *looking unto the creature*." He then observes, that the neglect of this introduced heathen idolatry; and continues thus: "Lest we should suffer the same "things, who have been instructed by the Scriptures to look to "the true Godhead; we have been taught to understand, that "*every created thing* is different from the Divine nature, and "to *adore and worship only the uncreated nature*, the character "of which is never to begin and never to end its existence."[y]

The language of Hilary, a deacon of the Roman Church in the time of Pope Damasus,[z] is also very remarkable, from its refutation of the pretences on which the worship of created beings has been justified in ancient and modern times. Speaking of the heathen he says: "They are accustomed, in order "to cover the shame of neglecting God, to use *a miserable* "*excuse*, saying, that by them [created beings] they can *ap-* "*proach* God, as we approach a king by his ministers. . . . "Come then: Is any one so *mad*, so *unmindful of his safety*, "as to give the *king's honour to a minister*—when, if any were "even found treating on such a matter, they would be justly "condemned as guilty of high treason? And yet these men "do not think themselves guilty who give the honour of God's "name to a *creature*, and leaving the Lord *adore their fellow* "*servants;* as if there was any thing more that could be re- "served to God. For we approach the king by his ministers, "because he is only a man, and knows not to whom he may "entrust the state. But to propitiate God, from whom noth- "ing is hid, (for he knows what all men deserve,) there is no "need of any other spokesman but a devout mind. Whereso- "ever such an one shall speak to Him, he will answer him."[a]

[y] Gregor. Nyss. contra Eunom. Orat. iv. t. ii. p 144, 146. Oper. ed. Paris. 1615.

[z] The commentary on the Epistles from which I quote, has been commonly attributed to St. Ambrose, but the researches of learned men have assigned its composition to Hilary. This writer had fallen into the schism of Lucifer bishop of Cagliari, but appears to have been reunited to the Church, as he speaks in very honourable terms of Pope Damasus. See Natalis Alexander, Hist. Eccl. sæc. iv. c. vi. art. 14.

[a] Comment. in Epist. ad Rom. c. i. Inter. Ambrosii Opera, t. ii. Appendix, p. 33. ed. Benedict.

It is evident from this, that the heathen did not intend to give the same honour to their deified men and to God: they regarded them as mediators, or as greatly inferior to the Supreme Deity. This is distinctly stated indeed by Tertullian, "Many," he says, "dispose the Godhead so, as to acknowledge "that One has the empire or supreme government, but that "many are engaged in His service; as Plato describes Jupiter "in heaven accompanied by an army of gods and spirits." It would be easy to confirm the truth of this statement from Orosius, Celsus, Hierocles, and other heathen writers. It is evident therefore, that the heathen did not mean, any more than Romanists do, to give supreme honours to beings who were inferior to the One Deity. And yet the Fathers most strenuously resisted *every act of external worship* offered to any being except God, on the broad principle which we also maintain, that *religious worship of every sort* is due only to the Creator—never to the creature.

St. Ambrose says, "We read that nothing but *God alone* is "to be adored, for it is written, 'Thou shalt *worship* the Lord "thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.'" St. Jerome, in describing the worship of the Christians, speaks thus; "We "do not *worship and adore* (I do not say merely) the relics of "the martyrs, but not even the Sun and Moon, the Angels or "Archangels, the Cherubim, Seraphim, or any name that is "named in this world or the world to come, *lest we should* "*serve the creature* more than the Creator, who is blessed for "ever. But we *honour* the relics of the Martyrs, that we may "*adore Him* whose Martyrs they are."[c] St. Gregory Nazianzen says, that the "one rule of piety is, to *worship* the Father, "the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the one Godhead and Power in "three Persons, *honouring nothing above or beneath God* . . . . "the former of which would be impossible, and the latter *im*-"*pious*."[d] St. Hilary of Poictiers teaches the same truth: "You are not ignorant that religious devotion towards a *crea*-"*ture, is accursed*."[e] St. Ambrose in another place uses expressions which come still more home to the question between us. "Without doubt the Holy Ghost is to be adored, since He

[b] Ambrose. de Spiritu Sancto, l. iii. c. 11. Oper. t. ii. p. 680. ed. Benedict.

[c] Hieronymi Epist. xxxvii. al. liii. ad Riparium, t. iv. pars ii. p. 279. Oper. ed. Benedict.

[d] Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. xiv. Oper. t. i. p. 221. ed. Paris, 1609.

[e] Hilar. Pictav. de Trinitate. lib. viii. p. 963. Oper. ed. Benedict. Compare the note of the Benedictine Editors; who state that Ambrose, Basil, Athenasius, Nyssene, &c. employ this principle in their proofs of the Divinity of our Lord.

"also is to be adored, who, according to the flesh, was born of "the Spirit. And lest any one should derive the same [adora-"tion] *to the Virgin Mary;* Mary was the *temple* of God, "but *not the God of the temple;* and therefore *He only is to* "*be adored* who operated in that temple."[f] How completely this language of St. Ambrose overthrows all your argument in defence of Cardinal Bona's prayer. Theodoret is equally strict in refusing all religious worship to any but God: "We *honour* "those men who live virtuously, as most excellent *men;* but "we *worship only* the God and Father of all, and his Word, "and Holy Spirit."[g] Epiphanius, like St. Ambrose, rejects the worship of the Virgin Mary and the Saints. "Which of the "prophets permitted a man (not to speak of a woman) to be "*worshipped?* For she (the Virgin) is indeed a chosen vessel, "but a *woman*, and in no respect changed in nature. . . . . But "neither is Elias to be worshipped, though amongst the living: "nor is John to be worshipped, ... neither is Thecla, nor "any of the Saints to be worshipped. For that ancient error "shall not prevail over us, to forsake the living God, and *to* "*worship the things that are made by Him*, for 'they served "and worshipped the creature above the Creator, and became "fools.' For if *He will not have the Angels to be worshipped,* "*how much more would he not have* (Mary) *her that was born* "*of Anna.*"[h] St. Augustine also condemns your practice: "Let not the *worship of dead men*," he says, "be our religion; "for if they lived piously, they are not to be supposed to seek "for such honours, but they wish Him to be worshipped by us, "by whose enlightening they rejoice that we are partners of "their merit. They are therefore to *be honoured for imitation,* "*not worshipped for religion.* . . . . We honour them (the "Angels) with *love*, not with *service;* nor do we build tem-"ples to them. For they do not wish to be so honoured by us, "because they know that we ourselves, if we are good, are "temples of the high God. It is therefore rightly written, "(Rev. xxii. 9.) that a man was forbidden by an angel that he "should not worship him, but *God alone*, under whom he was "his fellow-servant."[i]

I shall not carry the proof from Tradition any further at present. From what has been said, it must be evident I think to any candid mind, that Catholic Antiquity entirely accords

[f] Ambros. de Spiritu Sancto, lib. iii. c. 11. p. 681. t. ii. ed. Bened.
[g] Theodoret. Græcar. Affect. Sermo ii. p. 502. t. iv. Oper. ed. Sirmond.
[h] Epiphan. Hæres. lxxix. tom. ii. Oper. ed. Petavii, p. 1062.
[i] Augustin. de Vera. Relig. c. lv. t. i. Oper. ed. Benedict. p. 786, 787.

with us, in believing that all religious worship is due to the holy Trinity *alone;* and that it is unlawful to impart it, *in any degree*, to creatures; that even the *appearance* of worshipping creatures is to be avoided; that Angels, and Saints, and even the Virgin Mother of Christ our God, are to be loved and honoured indeed, but never *worshipped* or *adored* in any manner whatever; either above God, or equally with God, or even less than God.

II. "Ought prayer and praise only to be offered to God and "not to any creature? Is it a species of sacrifice which is only "due to the Deity? And are we bound to place our hope, "trust, and confidence in God only, and in no creature what-"ever?"

These questions are immediately connected with that which has just been considered; and all the sentiments of the Fathers which have been adduced, bear most directly on them; for prayer, and praise, trust, and confidence, are all *parts* of internal or external worship or adoration. If it be unlawful then to adore or worship creatures, it is equally unlawful to offer them religious prayer or praise, or to place hope and confidence in them. But I proceed to bring specific proofs from the Fathers, in confirmation of our doctrine, and in condemation of the doctrine and practice so common and so authorized in the Roman Communion.

I shall commence with St. Irenæus. "As the Church," he says, "has freely received from the Lord, so does she freely "minister; nor does she do any thing *by invocation of Angels*, "nor by incantations, nor by *any evil curiosity;* but by direct-"ing her prayers *cleanly*, and *purely*, and openly, to *the Lord* "*who made all things*, and calling on the name of our Lord "Jesus Christ."[k] It is evident from this, that St. Irenæus thought it unlawful to pray to Angels or any created being. St. Clement of Alexandria is equally explicit: "It is," he says, "the extreme of ignorance to ask from those who are not Gods, "as though they were Gods . . . . . Whence, since there is "only one good God, both we ourselves and the Angels *suppli-"cate from Him alone*, that some good things might be given "to us, and that others might remain with us."[l] That prayer is a *sacrifice* due to God, is taught by the same Father in the following terms: "We do not without cause *honour God by "prayer*, and with righteousness send up *this best and holiest "sacrifice*."[m] It is also maintained by Tertullian, thus: "We

[k] Irenæus, adv. Hæres. l. ii. c. xxxii. ed. Benedict. p. 166.
[l] Clemens Alexandr. Stromata, lib. vii. p. 853. ed. Potteri.
[m] Stromata, lib. vii. p. 848. See also p. 850.

"Christians pray for all rulers a long life, a secure government "..... These things *I cannot ask in prayer from any other* "except Him from whom I know that I shall obtain; both be- "cause He is the one who alone grants, and I am the one "whom it behoveth to obtain by prayer; being his servant, "*who looks to Him alone*, who for his religion am put to death, "who offer to Him *a rich and greater sacrifice* which He hath "commanded—even *prayer* proceeding from a chaste body, "from a harmless soul, from a holy spirit."[n]

"If," said Athenagoras, "*we lift up pure hands to Him* "(God), what need is there of a hecatomb? ..... What "have I to do with burnt offerings, which God does not require, "though it be necessary to offer to Him a bloodless sacrifice, "and a reasonable service?"[o]

The sacrifices of prayer and praise were then only to be offered up to God; as Origen expressly says. "Every prayer, and "supplication, and intercession, and thanksgiving, is to be sent "up unto God who is above all, through the High Priest who "is above all angels, the living Word and God..... For it is "not reasonable that those who do not comprehend the know- "ledge of Angels, which is beyond men, should *invoke them.* "And even supposing that their knowledge, which is somewhat "marvellous and secret, were comprehended; this very know- "ledge, declaring their nature and the things over which they "are appointed, *would not permit us to presume to pray to any* "*other but unto God*, the Lord over all, who is sufficient for "all, through our Saviour, the Son of God."[p] Nothing can be more conclusive—more decisively condemnatory of the practice of Romanists.

In another place Origen confirms our view very strongly: "To those who *place their confidence in the Saints*, we fitly "produce as an example, 'Cursed is the man which hopeth in "man;' and again, 'Do not put your trust in man;' and "another, 'It is better to trust in the Lord than in princes.' If "it be necessary to put our trust in any one, *Let us leave all* "*others, and hope in the Lord.*"[q]

Novatian, presbyter of the Roman Church in the middle of the third century, argues, as many of the Fathers have done, that Christ is God, because He is every where invoked. "If "Christ be only man," he says, "how is he present, being

[n] Tertull. Apologet. c. 30. p. 27. Oper. ed. Rigaltii.
[o] Athenagoras, *ubi supra*, p. 13.
[p] Origen cont. Celsum, lib. v. p. 580. t. i. Oper. ed. Delarue.
[q] Hom. iv. in Ezechiel, p. 373. t. iii. The Latin translation, from which the above passage is taken, was made by St. Jerome.

"invoked every where, since it is not the nature of man but of "God to be present in every place? . . . If Christ be only man, "why is *hope reposed in Him*, when *hope in man is said to be "accursed?*"[r] Had Invocation of Saints been practised at that time in the Church, Novatian could not have argued thus; because the immediate answer would have been, that Christ was invoked as a man, even as the Saints were. But his argument is directly opposed to any calling on created beings.

The doctrine of St. Athanasius is also strongly opposed to you. "It is written, 'Be my protecting God, my house of refuge, "and save me,' and 'the Lord was the refuge of the poor,' and "whatever things of the same sort are found in Scripture. "But if they say that these things are spoken of the Son, "which would perhaps be true, let them confess, that the "Saints *did not think of calling on a created being* to be their "helper and house of refuge."[s] Compare this with the prayer addressed to the Virgin by Cardinal Bona, and those to the Virgin and Joseph which have been produced.

It is really hard to imagine, how, in the face of such sentiments, Romanists can dare to appeal to Catholic Antiquity in justification of their idolatrous prayers to created beings. You have, however, explained what might otherwise have been hard to account for. You have demonstrated, that Romanism depends for its justification on *forged* and *spurious* compositions. You have proved, that it is still necessary to resort to such dishonest arts; that men of literary character like yourself are obliged to cling to them, in the desperate effort to support a bad and a feeble cause. It is in this way that your unhappy followers are deceived, blinded, and ruined.

We affirm with all the Fathers, that prayer is only to be offered to God. Look through their pages, and you will find that this doctrine enters into their very notion of prayer. "Prayer is a request of some good thing made by pious men *to "God*," says St. Basil.[t] It is "a discoursing with *God*," ac- "cording to St. Gregory Nyssene[u]—"a colloquy with *God*," according to St. John Chrysostom[x]—"an ascension of the mind

[r] Novatianus, De Trinitate, c. xiv. This Treatise was frequently attributed to Tertullian or Cyprian, even in the time of St. Jerome, as he remarks, Catalog. Script. Eccl. c. 81, and Apolog. cont. Ruf fin. lib. ii. Natalis Alexander has shewn that the doctrine of this Treatise is sound. Hist. Eccl. Sæc. ii. Dissert. xi. art. iv.

[s] Athanasii Orat. i. cont. Arianos, tom. i. p. 466. ed. Benedict.

[t] Basil. Orat. in Julitiam Martyr. Oper. t. ii. p. 33. ed. Benedict.

[u] Nyssen. Orat. ii. de Oratione Dom. Oper. ii. 724.

[x] Chrysost. Orat. ii. de Orat.

"*to God*, or a request of fit things *from God*," according to John Damascenus.[y] *Could* any of these Fathers have prayed to Saints? The thing is wholly impossible.

We have heard the doctrine of St. Athanasius: let us now attend to that of one of his successors, St. Theophilus of Alexandria. "How shall they call on Him in whom they have "not believed? It is necessary in the first place to believe "that the Son of God *is*, in order that *calling on Him* be right "and reasonable; and as *he who is not God is not to be adored*, "so, on the other hand, He that is God, is to be adored."[z] Here we see that invoking or "calling on" any one by prayer, is a part of adoration, and as such is due to God only. Hilary, Deacon of Rome, in commenting on the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Colossians, says, that the Apostle "in the beginning declared how great and infinite is the Almighty greatness of Christ, that He might instruct us, that *hope is only to "be placed in Him;* because all things are his, and because "nothing can exist without Him, neither in heaven nor in "earth. 'For He is before all things, and by Him all things "consist, because He hath the preeminence in all things;' so "that if any one thinks that he ought to be *devoted* to any of "the Angels, or elements, or powers, let him know that he is "in error."[a] This was the language of the fourth century. *Now* we hear of nothing but "devotion to the Virgin and the "Saints"—"trust" and "hope" in their power. What was impious in the fourth century, is now obtruded upon us as Catholic and laudable.

So strictly did the Catholic Church in primitive times adhere to the Apostolic tradition, that in the Eucharist, prayer was not even to be directed to the second or third Persons of the blessed Trinity. The third Council of Carthage, at which St. Augustine was present, decreed, that "At the Altar *prayer "should always be directed to the Father*, and whatever prayers "are composed by any one, he may not use till he has submitted them to the examination of the more learned brethren."[b] Thus jealous was the Catholic Church of the prerogatives of the Father, to whom our Lord had directed us to address our prayers in his name. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask *the Father* in my name, He will give it "you. . . . . At that day ye shall ask in my name; and I say

[y] Damascenus, De Fide Orthodox. lib. iii. c. 24. Oper. t. i. p. 248.
[z] Theophil. Alexandrinus, Paschal, ii. p. 718. t. iv. Bibl. Patr. Colon. 1618.
[a] Hilar. in Coloss. i. p. 266, Ambrosii Opera, t. ii. pars ii. ed. Ben.
[b] Concil. Carthag. iii. c. xxiii. Labbæi Concilia, t. ii. col. 1170.

"not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you; for the "Father Himself loveth you." (John xvi. 24, 26, 27.) And if our prayers are *generally* to be directed to the Father, instead of to the Son or the Holy Spirit—if even in the Trinity itself, where there is the *same Godhead* in three Persons, the priority of the Father is to be practically recognised in our worship, how much greater becomes the sin of those who worship and pray to mere creatures, as they would to the Supreme Fountain and First Principle of all things.

The practice of Romanists in praying to Angels was first invented by a sect in the fourth century, who for the purpose of exercising this unlawful worship, held private meetings separate from those of the Catholic Church, in which it was not permitted. The Council of Laodicea, the decrees of which were received and approved by the whole Church, condemned this sect in the following terms: "Christians ought not to for-"sake the Church of God, and depart, and *call on angels*, and "make meetings; which are forbidden. If any one therefore "be found giving himself to this hidden *idolatry*, *Let him be* "*Anathema*, because he hath left our Lord Jesus Christ the "Son of God, and hath betaken himself to *idolatry*."[c] Prayers to Angels are forbidden in this decree, but the same principle applies equally to all prayers to created beings. Prayers to Angels and Saints were therefore in the judgment of the Catholic Church of the fourth century, *idolatrous*; and yet you adopt and defend those prayers without any scruple.

The adoration of the Virgin was also introduced about the same time, and was regarded as a *heresy* by the Catholic Church. It commenced in Arabia about A. D. 373, and seems to have given rise to an opposite heresy, that of the Antidicomarians, who spoke irreverently of the blessed Virgin. We learn that the sinful and misguided persons who adopted this new worship made offerings of cakes to the Virgin at particular times of the year, from which they were called Collyridians, (a word which signified the nature of their offering.) There is no evidence that they separated from the Church or its worship, or refused to worship God, or regarded the Virgin as equal to God. They are not accused of this by any writer. They, however, offered external worship to the Virgin, and were therefore regarded as heretics. St. Epiphanius has refuted this heresy,

[c] Concil. Laodicen Can. xxxv. Beveregii Pandect. Canon. t i. p. 468. This heresy is referred to by Epiphanius, Hæres lx. Oper. t. ii. p. 505. and by St. Augustine, Lib. de Hæres. n. xxxix t viii. p. 11. Oper. ed. Ben.; and it seems to have become extinct in a short time.

and at the same time furnished the strongest arguments against Romanists, in a work from which the following extracts are made.—

"The body of Mary was holy indeed, but she was not God. "She was a Virgin and honoured, but not proposed to us *to be* "*worshipped*, but as worshipping Him who, born of her flesh, "had descended from Heaven and from his Father's bosom. "Therefore the Gospel warned us beforehand, in which Christ "thus speaketh, 'What have I to do with thee, *woman?* my "hour is not yet come,' in order that from this expression, "'What have I to do with thee, woman?' none might think "the holy virgin more excellent (in nature) . . . . none might "*by excessively admiring* the Saint, fall into this folly of *heresy*.[d] "Which of the prophets ever permitted a man to be worshipped, "not to speak of a *woman?*[e] Let Mary be in *honour*, but let "Father, Son, and Holy Spirit be *worshipped:* let no one wor- "ship Mary. That service is *not enjoined* by God; I say not "to a woman, but even to a man. Not even the Angels are "worthy of such honours. . . . Let no one taste of that error "concerning the holy Mary, for although the tree be beautiful, "it is not good for food; and although Mary is most excellent, "and holy, and worthy of honour, yet she is *not to be worship-* "*ped*. . . . . Let such women (as worship her) be silenced by "Jeremiah, and no longer disturb the world. Let them not "say, '*We honour the Queen of Heaven.*'[f] Let Mary be in "honour. Let the Lord be worshipped. For the righteous "afford to no one an occasion of error."[g]

To speak of the blessed Virgin as *a woman*, in the way which St. Epiphanius here does, would be regarded by many Romanists as little less than blasphemous. If indeed those magnificent titles which they bestow on her (amongst which is that very one of "Queen of Heaven," here reprehended by St. Epiphanius) be rightly and piously applied, it must be disrespectful to speak of her as "a woman."

III. "Is it necessary to ask for the intercession of Saints and "Angels with God, or is it better to approach the throne of God "with our own prayers, relying with confidence on the inter- "cession of the Great High Priest Jesus Christ?"

Our belief is in this case also confirmed by the voice of Catholic tradition, and the practice and opinions of Romanists approximate to those of the heathen and heretics, against whom the holy Fathers contended.

[d] Epiphan. Hæres. lxxix. t. ii. Oper. p. 1061.
[e] p. 1062. [f] p. 1062. [g] p. 1066.

You have quoted (p. 64) Valerian, Bishop of Cemela, A. D. 450, as urging the necessity of having recourse to the Saints, because "it is the only way to secure the favour of God." "What place of pardon will there be," he says, "if you know "not how *to entreat the friends of the king?*" I have not examined into the genuineness of this piece—but admitting it to be genuine, I maintain that the doctrine here advanced was not that of the Catholic Church.

The heathen, as we learn from the example of Celsus, defended their worship and prayers addressed to Angels or Spirits, by representing that we ought to put our trust in them because they were ministers of God. To this Origen replies: "Away "with the advice of Celsus, saying that we should pray to "Angels, and let it not be heard for a moment. For *we must "pray to God alone* who is above all, and we must pray to "the only-begotten Word of God, 'the first-born of all crea-"tures,' and we must entreat Him, *as a high priest, to offer up "our prayers to his God and our God.*[h] We must endeavour "to please God *alone*, who is above all things, and labour to "have Him propitious to us, procuring His good will by god-"liness and all kinds of virtue. And if Celsus will yet have "us to procure *the good will of any others* after Him that is "God over all .... having God, favourable to us, who is over "all, it follows that we shall have all His friends both Angels "and Spirits loving unto us.[i] To whom we offer our first fruits, "to Him also do we send our prayers, having a great High "Priest that is entered into the heavens.... But if we have "a desire towards a *multitude* [of Saints, Angels, &c.] whom "we wish to be favourable unto us, we learn that thousand "thousands stand by Him,' &c.... who labour together "for the salvation of those who *call upon God, and pray law-"fully*"[k]

I have already quoted the answer of Hilary the Deacon to the argument for the necessity of appealing to creatures in order to propitiate God. St. John Chrysostom speaks still more distinctly. "It is often impossible to present our gift immediately "unto the masters themselves, and to converse with them, but "it is necessary first to obtain the favour of their ministers and "stewards..... *But with God it is not so*, for there is no *need "of intercessors for the petitioners*, nor is *He so ready to give a "gracious answer, being entreated by others, as by our own "selves praying unto Him.*[l] Amongst men it is required that he "should flatter all those that are about the prince .... but here

[h] Origen. cont. Celsum, l. viii. p. 760. t. i. Oper. ed. Benedict.
[i] P. 789.
[k] P. 766.
[l] Cited by Damascenus, Sacra, Parallela, t. ii. Oper. p. 466.

"there is no need of any thing save a watchful mind only, and "there is nothing that hindereth us from being near to God."[m] "*God does most when we do not ask of others.* As a kind "friend, *he blameth us most*, as *not having courage to trust in* "*his love*, when we entreat others to pray to Him for us.[n] We "do not therefore so pacify Him when we entreat Him by "others, as when we do it by our own selves."[o] Damascenus, in the eighth century, adopts these sentiments. "Mark the "philosophy of the woman of Canaan. She entreats not James, "she beseeches not John, neither does she come to Peter, but "broke through the whole company. I have no need of a me- "diator, but taking repentance as my spokesman, I come to the "Fountain-head itself. For this cause did he descend, for this "cause did He take flesh, that I might have the boldness to "speak unto Him. . . . . I have no need of a mediator: Have "mercy on me."[p] This is even the language of Theophylact, Metropolitan of Bulgaria in the *eleventh* century. Speaking of the woman of Canaan: "Observe," he says, "that although "the Saints pray for us as the Apostles did for her, yet *we* "*praying for ourselves, prevail much more*."[q] These authorities are sufficient to shew that the ancient Church did not believe it necessary to use the Saints as mediators with God, and that they held it much safer and more pious to approach God with our own prayers, confiding in the intercession of Jesus Christ.

IV. "Is it lawful to unite the name of God with that of His "creatures in prayer, and to offer the same acts of homage to "both at the same time?"

In proof of the unlawfulness of this practice, I shall only adduce the language of the great Athanasius. "*No one*," he says, "would pray to receive any thing from the *Father and* "*the Angels*, or from *any of the other creatures*. Nor would "any one say, 'God and the Angel give thee.'" In reply to the objection derived from Jacob's language, Gen. xlviii. 15, 16. "The God which fed me from my youth . . . . . the Angel "which delivered me, &c." Athanasius says, "He *did not* "*couple one of the created beings*, and by nature Angels, with "God who created them . . . but in saying, 'which delivered "me from all evils, he shewed that it was not any of the "created Angels, but *the Word of God*, whom he coupled with

m Chrysost. in Psal. iv. t. p. 8. ed. Benedict.
n Hom. xxxvi. in Act. Apost t. ix. p. 278.
o Expos. in Ps. iv. t. v. p. 9.
p Cited by Damascenus, Oper. t. ii. p. 467.
q Theophylact. Comment. in. Matt. c. xv. p. 89. ed. Paris, 1631.

"God and prayed unto."[r] I need not produce any further evidence. Compare this with your indulgenced prayer, "Jesus, "*Joseph, and Mary,* assist me in my last agony."

I have produced but a small portion of the evidence which may be brought from Christian Antiquity in refutation of your doctrines and practice on this subject. What has been said, however, will I trust be sufficient for the vindication of the early Fathers from the imputations of superstition and idolatry which your pamphlet tends to fix upon them. Their doctrines stand out in bold relief, against the heathenish corruptions which Romanism sanctions and defends.

§. 6. *Additional proofs of Romish Idolatry and Superstition.*

We have now sufficiently seen what the doctrine of the Catholic Fathers is on the subject of the worship of creatures. Let us contrast it with the doctrines and practice of Romanism. I can only afford space for a very few citations from your popular books of devotion, but they will afford a fair specimen of the remainder.

Your admired Saint Alphonsus de Liguori shall speak first.

"From the moment that Mary consented to become the Mother of God," says St. Bernardine of Sienna, "she merited to receive *sovereignty over all creatures*." Mary and Jesus having but one and the same flesh," says St. Arnand, abbot, "why should not the Mother enjoy, *conjointly with the Son*, the honours of royalty." Mary is then *Queen of the Universe,* since Jesus is its King: thus. as St Bernardine again observes, "As many creatures as obey God, so many obey the glorious Virgin."[s] "I am," said she, to St. Bridget, "the Queen of heaven and Mother of Mercy"—I am "the joy of the just, and the gate through which sinners go to God." (p 22.) "*Queen of heaven and earth!* Mother of God! my Sovereign mistress! I present myself before you as a poor mendicant before a mighty Queen. (p. 29.) No grace, no pardon, emanates from the throne of the King of kings without passing through the hands of Mary, according to St Bernard. The plenitude of Grace is found in Jesus Christ as the head, whence it flows to Mary,

[r] Athanasii Orat. iii. cont. Arianos, t. i. p. 566.

[s] The Glories of Mary, Mother of God, translated from the Italian of Saint Alphonsus Liguori by a Catholic Priest. Third Edition, Dublin, Coyne, 1837.

who communicates it to all his members. (p. 121.) No doubt, Jesus the Man-God, alone sufficed to effect our redemption; but it was more convenient that both sexes having concurred to our ruin, both should conspire to save us. Albertus Magnus styles Mary 'the coadjutrix of our redemption!" (p. 128.) ALL IS SUBJECT TO MARY'S EMPIRE, EVEN GOD HIMSELF! .... Jesus has rendered Mary *omnipotent:* the one is omnipotent by nature, *the other is omnipotent by grace.* (p. 138.) St. Germanus says to Mary, 'You, O holy Virgin, *have over God the authority of a mother*, and hence you obtain pardon for the most obdurate sinners' (p 141.) It is impossible that a true servant of Mary should be damned. (p. 165.) 'My soul,' says the blessed Eric Suzon, 'is in the hands of Mary, so if the Judge wishes to condemn me, the sentence must pass through this clement Queen, and she well knows how to prevent its execution. (p. 171.) O Jesus! O Mary! may your names live in my heart ... O Mary! my Mother! when my last hour shall come, when my I beseech you, that my last words may be, Jesus, Mary, I love soul shall be at the eve of its departure from the world, grant you. Jesus Mary, I give you my heart and my soul. Amen." (p. 205.)

My next extracts shall be from "the New Month of Mary," published last year with the formal approbation of authority.[1]

"Thou art *the only hope of sinners.* Through thee do we hope for pardon of our sins; and in thee, O most blessed Lady, is the expectation of our rewards. (p. 42.) Recite the Acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity, to-day, in honour of Mary, and make this one of the devotions which you will resolve to practise in her honour. (p. 121.) In all the infirmities of the body, and all the maladies of the soul, be thou, O Mary, my refuge and my relief. Numberless are the sick who through thee have recovered health Relying on thy power and goodness, I fly to thee, and implore thee to heal my infirmities, and obtain for me perfect health of body and of soul, that I may be the better able to serve *thee* and *thy Divine Son.* (p. 146.) O heavenly Queen, thou dost excel the highest of the Angelic host in merit, in grace, and in holiness. All heavenly spirits bow down before thee, and praise and glorify thee." (p. 168.)

[1] The New Month of Mary, principally designed for the Month of May, by the Very Rev P. R. Kenrick. Dolman, London, 1841. Approved, April 25, 1841, by "F. P. Kenrick, Bp. Arath. and Coadji. of Bp. Philadelphia."

The next extracts shall be made from "Devotion to the holy "Angels from the French of Boudon. Dublin, 1837."

"The Virgin Mary 'being the august Empress of Paradise,' the Angels are her subjects, and consider it a great honour to be obedient to her laws. (p. 44) It is most useful to perform a Novena in honour of the Angels. . . . . It may be as follows: the first day honour the Angels of the last choir by some prayer —nine *Gloria Patris* for example—and ask them for the grace or favour you want; and thus ascend to all the choirs successively. . . . . On the first day ask the Angels to obtain for you a lively faith; on the second, beg of the Archangels holy zeal; on the third, honour the Principalities, and beg the extinction of the reign of sin. (p. 62.) Tuesday in each week . . . should be sacred to the Angelic devotion. (p. 62.) If we would be truly devout to the Angels, we should once for all take the resolution of avoiding deliberate faults and imperfections, of searching out and overcoming our predominant passion . . . . Endeavour every day to *sacrifice* some inclination of yours in honour of the Angels. (p. 69) It was proposed to form an Association for the purpose [of worshipping the Angels], each member of which would successively honour the Angels in the name of the rest—and thus a *continual homage* would be rendered to these blessed Spirits. (p. 71) [The Pope granted *Indulgences* in favour of this Association, p. 71] Some persons devout to the holy Angels . . . . wished to dedicate to these holy Spirits *a whole month*—that of October. They during that period perform the following practices &c. . . . . O, all ye holy Angels . . . . I your unworthy servant, present and offer you all the practices of this month, consecrated to you, not only as a means of obtaining, (*here specify your request.*) but also as a reparation for my past ingratitude, and that of all men. (p. 75) [After this follow, 'The Little Office of the Holy Angels; Hymns to the Angels, Litany of the Saints who have been specially favoured by the Angels; Beads of the holy Angels; Litany of the holy Angels; Litany of the Angel Guardian,' &c.]"

I extract the following from "Reflections on the prerogatives, "power, and protection of Saint Joseph . . . . with special devo- "tions to that most glorious Patriarch. London, 1825."

"He must be looked on as his (Jesus') legitimate parent, and entitled in all things to the right of paternity, except that of generation, which according to Rupertus Abbas, the eternal Father supplied, by infusing into the husband of Mary a pater-

nal love for her Son Jesus. (p. 6.) The illuminated St. Theresa of Jesus ... (said,) I have seen clearly, that this *Father and Lord of mine*, St. Joseph, hath drawn me, as well out of this necessity, being crippled with sickness, as out of others greater, when there was question of honour and loss of my soul. (p. 37.) This glorious Saint brings also whole provinces and nations to the Catholic faith. New France owns him as the propagator of His gospel whose legal parent he was. (p. 64.) The universal practice of honouring our holy Patriarch, is to recite his little office, his litanies, hymn, and prayer, either *daily* or for a set time. (p 72.) There are several other ways of honouring him, as to say the beads, to wear rings with his name engraved ..... others have on their rings Jesus, Maria, Joseph. (p. 85.) O holy Joseph ... I. N. N. in the presence of Jesus and Mary, do from this moment choose you for my *Lord and Master*. (p. 89.) [After this follows the office of St. Joseph, or worship of him *seven times in the day*, The Litany of St. Joseph, a Hymn in his honour, Beads of St. Joseph, Seven Prayers to St. Joseph in honour of his seven dolours, Eight Meditations on his Life.]"

The following extracts are taken from "The imitation of the "blessed Virgin composed on the plan of *the imitation of Christ*. "From the French. Dublin, Coyne, 1836."

"Thou art truly become *the Queen of the world, as well as the Queen of Heaven* ... O Virgin Mother, the highest in grace and perfection among the Angels, deserves only to rank among thy servants; so great is the distance between him and thee. (p. 268.) I comprehend that in that quality (Mother of Jesus) thou hast a sort of right over all the treasures of grace .... Who can comprehend the elevation of thy dignity? All is so great and eminent in the Mother of God, that the Seraphims themselves can only admire it. (p. 269.) At the sight of thy greatness and sublime elevation, I am seized with religious fear and respect, which, as it were, annihilates me at thy feet. (p. 270. He (God) has given her a sort of superintendence over His treasures, and it is through her that He is pleased to distribute them to us." (p. 289.)

I quote the following from "The glories of Saint Joseph, "chiefly taken from the French of Rev. Father Paul Barrie. Dublin, 1835."

"As God the Son is the Redeemer of mankind, so St. Joseph is his coadjutor in this great work, since he employs all his

cares . . . to gain wherewithal to nourish and maintain our merciful Redeemer. Lastly, as the Holy Ghost is the spouse of Mary the Mother of God, so St. Joseph is also her spouse. What, therefore, can be a greater subject of jealousy to the Angels than this? (p. 25.) The learned and devout Gerson says, that if the first rank or hierarchy in heaven is that of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; so the second is this of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph; and that all other Saints are of a lower rank, and of a different hierarchy. These other great Saints hold, indeed, the first place in their rank and hierarchy, according to the ordinary law of love; but not in that of the order of the Hypostatical union, and in the mystery of the Incarnation, wherein those are only comprised, who most nearly relate to Jesus and Mary: namely, St. Joseph, who completes this created Trinity. (p. 39, 40.)

The following passages are extracted from "A Short Treatise on the Antiquity, &c. of the Confraternity of our blessed "Lady of Mount Carmel. Dublin, 1838."

"Another benefit or privilege of this Confraternity of the Scapular, is contained in these words: he that dieth invested with this habit *shall not suffer eternal fire:* which is as much as to say, that the Scapular is a great help in order to obtain eternal felicity. (p. 43.) St. Anselm saith, There is no doubt but the blessed Virgin Mary, by maternal right, is *with Christ, president of heaven and earth.* St. John Damascene saith, it is fitting and convenient that Mary should possess what is her Son's..... She being really Mother of the Word incarnated, there is in all propriety due to her a certain power; or as others say, *a dominion over all things*, as well spiritual as temporal, to which the authority of her Son doth extend itself. So that she had by natural right of maternity, *a power almost like that of her Son.* (p 49.) Purify my heart, O immaculate Virgin, from every sin, ... purge this soul of its affection for earthly and sinful goods, and raise it to the love of celestial and heavenly blessings." (p. 74.)

I need not carry this proof any further. The passages which I have selected are taken almost at random from a few of your books of popular devotion, and furnish but an imperfect specimen of the real state of religious worship amongst Romanists. I am obliged to refrain from citing similar passages from numbers of books now lying before me. I cannot afford space for describing the multiplicity of your acts of worship and adora-

tion to the Virgin, the Saints, and Angels—The special months devoted to their daily worship—The repetition of hymns, prayers, and litanies to them *seven times in* the day—The vows [illegible] to them—The Eucharist offered *to their honour*—Acts of hope, and charity, the reception of the holy Eucharist, a mass being, all the works of religion done to *please them*—Offerings and gifts to them—Confraternities for the purpose of worshipping them, supported by Papal Indulgences—Confession made to them *conjointly with God*—The ascription of all the titles and prerogatives of the Creator to his creatures. How deplorable, how awful, is this scene of superstition and idolatry! And how fearful a contrast does it present to the religion of Scripture and of Antiquity! Can nothing awaken the conscience of Romanists to a sense of what is due to GOD?

I can only adduce one more passage in illustration of your religious system. It is taken from the writings of Alphonsus de Liguori, your favourite Saint, and describes the mode in which those who are in their last agony are to be aided by the priest.

"When the sick man comes to his agony, let the Priest employ the usual arms of the Church in his assistance. 1. Let him often *sprinkle him with blessed water*, especially if he is troubled by diabolical temptations. . . . 2. Let him fortify him *with the sign of the cross*, and bless him, saying, 'God the Father who created thee bless thee, &c.' . . . . 3. Let him frequently give him the *image of our Saviour and of Mary to kiss*. 4. Let him take care that the sick person gains *all the Indulgences that he can*, and especially receives benediction in the article of death, with plenary indulgence granted by Benedict XIV. . . . . 5. Let him suggest some sentiment of grief, conformity, hope in the passion of God *and the intercession of St. Mary*. . . . . 6. Let him endeavour that the names of Jesus *and Mary* be very frequently invoked, at least mentally, and the prayer, '*Mary, mother of grace*,' be said. 7. In the last agony let him cause the bystanders to say *many litanies of the Virgin Mary* for the sick man. It is desirable to procure the bell of the agony to be rung. . . . 8. As the time of expiring draws near, let the Priest with a mournful voice and bended knees recite the accustomed prayers of the Church, 'Go forth, &c.' . . . 9. (Directions as to handling the sick person.) 10. When he is near death, let him give him *a blessed candle*, and thus profess that he dies in the faith. 11. While he is yet sensible, it will be advisable to give him Absolution *frequently*, after a short

reconciliation. . . . . Let him admonish him *often to call on the names of Jesus and Mary.*[u]

"When the sick man is near expiring, the [following] acts should be recited *without pausing and in a loud voice* [by the Priest].

"Lord Jesus receive my spirit. My God, help me, permit me to come and love thee for ever. My Jesus, my Love, I love thee I repent. I wish that I had never offended thee! *O Mary my hope,* help me, pray for me to Jesus. My Jesus, for thy passion save me. I love thee! *Mary, my mother,* in this hour help me. *St. Joseph,* help me. *Archangel Michael,* defend me. *Guardian Angel,* guard me. *Saint N.* (here let the principal protector of the sick man be named) commend me to Jesus Christ. *Saints of God,* intercede for me. Jesus, Jesus, Jesus. Jesus *and Mary,* I give my heart and my soul to you!"[x]

I should only injure the effect of this most awful scene by offering any comments: I leave it to the reflections of the Reader. May the last hours of those he loves have other consolations—and *peace.*

On the remainder of your Pamphlet I can at present only make one or two remarks.[y] The passages which you have adduced (p. 79, 80.) in support of the doctrine of Purgatory do not relate to it. They shall be examined in my next Letter. I shall also have an opportunity of considering your remarks on Indulgences. I did not mean to deny your veracity as you suppose, (p. 84,) in calling for *sufficient evidence* of the fact, and implying that "others might have been able to give a "somewhat different account." I merely meant, that what you did not think superstitious might have appeared in a widely

[u] Ligorio, Theologia Moralis, t. ix. p. 175. (Praxis Confessarii, n. 276.)

[x] Ib. p. 178, 179.

[y] I would refer an anonymous Correspondent to my Treatise on the Church, Part ii. c. xi. objections x. and xi. It can never, under any circumstances, be lawful to profess what is false or deny what is true. The *wish* for union may however exist; and may be lawful, even where great corruptions are visible, provided there is no intention of uniting in those corruptions, but rather an intention of protesting against them.

different point of view to others. With reference to your observation (p. 4.) that my denial of your ordination was irrelevant, I must say that it was *highly relevant* in a controversy *between you and me;* because, had I admitted your assumed title of bishop, it would have been necessary to address you in a tone of great respect. You have hinted that my style is uncourteous: I confers that I have not treated you with any ceremony, because I do not recognise Romish ordinations in these countries,[z] and am unwilling to place them on a level with those of the Catholic Church in England. If there has been any apparent uncourteousness in the tone of these Letters, it has not, I assure you, arisen from any desire to inflict pain; for to yourself personally, I can have no feeling but that of good-will. It is intended to apply to you only in your *official capacity,* as Vicar Apostolic and pretended bishop.

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

WILLIAM PALMER.

Oxford, June 8, 1841.

NOTE.

A layman of the Romish persuasion, calling himself VERAX, has published a Letter to me on the worship of the Virgin Mary, in which the Fathers are quoted copiously in justification of the prayers to which attention was drawn in my First Letter. This gentleman has prevented me from noticing his proofs more particularly, by omitting to annex references to his quotations. I observe, however, that many of them are derived from *spurious* productions, and in particular, a long passage purporting to be from S. Augustine (Sermo 18, de Sanctis), on which this writer, and Mr. Ambrose Phillips in his recent pamphlet, have rested the whole strength of their cause. Verax, in his Appendix, puts questions and difficulties to me, which only shew his entire ignorance of the Anglo-Catholic Theology of the present day.

[z] See Treatise on the Church of Christ, Part vi. chap. xi; Episcopacy Defended against Wiseman, Sect. xviii.

A

SIXTH LETTER

TO

N. WISEMAN, D. D.

ON THE

DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M. A.

OF WORCESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

BALTIMORE:
JOSEPH ROBINSON,
110 BALTIMORE STREET.

1843.

A SIXTH LETTER, &c.

§ 1. *Introduction.*

Sir,

In my preceding Letters your Controversial Lectures were frequently referred to for statements and proofs of Romish doctrines, not with any particular view of calling on you for a defence of those Lectures, but merely because they contain a recent and tolerably authentic exposition of Romish tenets. In future, however, a more sparing use shall be made of your productions, since it appears from the conclusion of your "Remarks" on my first Letter, that you "have on principle, declined answering several attacks on your Controversial Lectures; and that it will require particular reasons to induce you to alter your past course." I beg you distinctly to understand, that it has not been my object to "attack your Controversial Lectures," but to contend against the system of which they furnish a convenient exposition. This explanation will, I trust, have the effect of enabling you, without any compromise of "principle," to continue your defence of principles and practices, in vindication of which you so eagerly rushed forward, when you imagined that they had been misrepresented by Mr. Newman.

The course of these Letters now brings us to consider the doctrine of Purgatory. And here, Sir, I am ready to admit, that if the description given by Romish controversialists of their belief on this point, did really and fairly represent the doctrines which are currently received amongst you, we might be in some degree inclined to wonder at the opposition which has been made to the doctrine of Purgatory. It is the uniform practice of your modern writers to *keep out of view* all those offensive doctrines which are universally received amongst Romanists, although they have not been actually and formally defined by the Council of Trent; and we are thus to be persuaded, that the Roman Churches are in no degree responsible for such doctrines—that they are the mere private opinions of individuals—that they may be disputed or denied at pleasure; while at the same time, those very doctrines are sedulously inculcated on your own people, universally believed and appro-

ved; and their denial by any member of your Communion, would cause the highest scandal. They are never, in fact opposed by any Romanists, without bringing down on them the imputation of Jansenism, or of some other heresy; and if your opponents are ever able to bring it to the test whether you really do or do not hold them, we find that they are immediately defended with the utmost pertinacity.

Of this you have yourself afforded an example in the present controversy. Romanists are continually assuring us, that they only invoke the Saints to "*pray for us*" to God, and that they are, therefore, most unjustly accused of idolatrous practices. I shewed, that it is an *authorized* practice in your Communion, to pray to the Saints in the very terms in which God is addressed; to offer them Divine honours, to regard them as fountains of grace; to place religious trust and confidence in them; to set them, in every respect, on a level with God. You had repudiated all such imputations; but when they were actually brought home to your Communion, you at once stepped forward to express your approbation of all the most obnoxious expressions and practices that had been adduced, and to justify them by still more objectionable passages from spurious and forged writings.

The same line of proceeding has been followed by your controversialists with reference to the doctrine now before us. The obnoxious doctrines connected with Purgatory are never obtruded on us: they are studiously kept out of view: and our attention is directed only to the points which have been formally defined by the Council of Trent. Thus Dr. Milner remarks, that "all which is necessary to be believed by Romanists on this subject, is contained in the following brief declaration of the Council of Trent: 'There is a Purgatory, and the souls detained there are helped by the prayers of the faithful, and particularly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar.'"[a] M. Bouvier, Bishop of Mans, observes, that these "two points only have been defined by the Church as matters of Catholic faith," and that "other matters are left free to the discussion of theologians."[b] Perrone again, as cited by you in your Letter to Mr. Newman, (p. 15), makes nearly the same statement; and adds, that "every thing relating to the place, duration, and quality of the pains of Purgatory, does not pertain to the Catholic faith," &c. "The Faith of Catholics," by the Romish priests Berington and Kirk, states, that all such questions are "superfluous and impertinent as to faith." (2nd Ed. p. 355)

[a] End of Controv. Lett. xliii.
[b] Tractatus de Pœnitentia, p. 285.

If, Sir, the doctrine of Purgatory went no further than this, I believe there would not be any great repugnance to it. If to assert that "there is a Purgatory, and that the souls detained there are helped by our prayers," be sufficient, we need not have any further difference on this point. We admit "a Purgatory" just as much as you do, that is to say, a Purgatory in this *present life;* and we believe "that the souls detained there are helped by the prayers of the faithful." Will this satisfy you? Oh no! You will be ready to pronounce such a doctrine mere *heresy*. It is therefore evident, that your doctrine goes beyond the mere wording of the decree of Trent, or of the Creed of Pius V. Let us, then, ascertain what the doctrine of Romanists really is.

In my first Letter (p. 27.) I enquired, in reference to your quotation from Perrone, which was intended to shew that Romanists are at *liberty* to speculate on the nature of Purgatory, whether he does not add to his statement, "that the doctrine of a purging material fire is the general and most probable opinion of theologians?;" and I also requested you to produce the entire passage. With this request you have declined to comply;[c] and I shall therefore copy what immediately follows your quotation, in order that we may be able to see how far Romanists are at liberty to speculate on points involved in the doctrine of Purgatory, though not actually comprised in the definition of the Council of Trent.

Having stated then, that "matters relating to the place, duration, and quality of pains in Purgatory do not pertain to to the Catholic faith," Perrone proceeds thus:

"We are not ignorant, that there are *some* of those things which we have said do not pertain to *faith*, which *although they be not defined, cannot be rejected* without a mark of *temerity;* since not only the *common doctrine of theologians* concerning them, (from which it is unlawful for any discreet Catholic to depart without most weighty reason,) is sufficiently known; but also the *sense of the Church herself*, especially with reference to THE SEVERITY OF THE PUNISHMENTS WITH WHICH SOULS ARE TORTURED IN PURGATORY."[d]

[c] Remarks, &c., p. 78.

[d] Haud ignoramus ex his, quæ diximus ad fidem minime spectare, aliqua esse, quæ quamvis definita non sint, absque temeritatis nota rejici non posse, quum satis innotescat circa ea non solum communis theologorum doctrina, a qua cordato Catholico absque gravissima causa recedere nefas est, sed insuper ipsius ecclesiæ sensus, præsertim circà pœnarum acerbitatem, quibus animæ in Purgatorio cruciantur.—Perrone, Theologia, t. iii. p. 321. ed. Rom. 1836.

This passage throws considerable light on the subject. It appears that although Perrone does not *expressly* state that the doctrine of a material purging fire is most commonly received by theologians, he does inform us, that there are various points, not put before us by Romish Controversialists, which cannot be rejected by Romanists, without rendering themselves liable to *formal condemnation* by the authorities of their Communion; for the "common doctrine of theologians," and "the sense of the Church herself" are the ordinary grounds for Papal and Episcopal censures. Let us next endeavour to ascertain, what points may be considered to have the general sanction of theologians, and to represent the sense of the Roman Church.

§ 2. *Doctrine of Purgatory stated and refuted.*

I. In the first place then, it is the doctrine of the Roman Church and of all her theologians, that the souls detained in Purgatory suffer dreadful tortures from fire, as well as in many other ways, and that their punishment differs from that of hell only in duration, the one being temporal, the other eternal. Bouvier Bishop of Mans writes in the following terms: "*All agree* that there is a twofold punishment in Purgatory, one of 'loss,' which is the delay of the beatific vision; and the other of 'sense.' This, according to the Grecks, is caused by severe labours and pains: but *the constant belief of the Latins* is, that there is in Purgatory a material fire *like the fire of hell;* and therefore that the Church, in praying for the souls of the faithful, does not ask merely for 'a place of light and peace,' but for a place 'of *cooling*,' i. e. against the ardour of the fire.'[e] "*It is certain*," says Cardinal Bellarmine, "that in Purgatory, *as also in hell*, is a punishment of fire, whether that fire be understood properly or metaphorically."[f] In another place he observes that the temporal punishment to be endured after the remission of sin, "is *the very same sensible punishment* which the sinner ought to have suffered in hell, with the exception of its *eternity*."[g] Dens teaches that the pains of Purgatory are the same as those of hell.[h] Delahogue says that "theologians commonly teach" that the souls in Purgatory "are confined in some dark prison, and tortured by some fire."[i] Natalis Alexander having observed that "it is not a dogma of *faith* that the fire of

[e] Bouvier, de Pœnitentia, p. 285.
[f] Bellarminus de Purgatorio, lib. ii. c. x.
[g] Bellarminus de Pœnitentia, lib. iv. c. i.
[h] Dens, Theologia, t. vi. p. 40.
[i] Delahogue, de Pœnitentia, p. 304.

Purgatory is real and corporeal," says, "I reply thirdly, that *according to the more probable opinion* RECEIVED BY THE CHURCH, the fire of Purgatory is real and corporeal, and nevertheless tortures incorporeal souls."[k] In fine, Pope Benedict XIV. fully explains to us the doctrine of the Roman Church, as to the tortures suffered in Purgatory.

He remarks on a certain part of the Canon of the Mass, that the Priest therein prays, "for all those who are expiating in the *fire of Purgatory;* and requests for them all 'a place of cooling,' which refers to that *fire in which they are burning;* 'a place of light,' which relates to that *darkness* in which they are; 'a place of repose,' which regards that *anxiety of mind* with which they are struggling; by which threefold species of punishments those *miserable souls* are expiated by the DIVINE JUSTICE."[l]

In explaining a disputed passage in a Mass for the dead, the same Pontiff says: "But that we may determine something, it seems that we should say that the Church, in that anthem or offertory in Masses for the dead, means the punishments of *Purgatory;* and calls *Purgatory* HELL, BECAUSE THERE IS THE SAME FIRE IN BOTH PLACES; and prays that souls may be delivered 'from the deep pit, and the mouth of the lion,' that is, from the subterranean *prison* in which the souls of the just are expiated; and finally, that the Church prays of God that 'Tartarus may not swallow them up, and that they may not fall into darkness,' that is, that they may not be longer detained in that *gloomy prison,* STRUGGLING IN SO MANY TORTURES."[m]

This then is the sense of the Roman Church, from which, as Perrone remarks, no discreet member of her Communion can recede, without the imputation of temerity at least. It is her doctrine, that the souls in Purgatory are tortured by fire, and other torments, in the same manner as the lost souls are tortured in hell.

II. It is also held, that the duration of the pains of Purgatory is wholly unknown, and those who have maintained that they are of short duration, have been *condemned* by the Roman Church. Tournely says that we cannot and ought not certainly to affirm any thing with regard to "the duration" of this punishment.[n] Bouvier, Bishop of Mans, in reply to the question "How long are the souls of the *just* detained in Purgatory?" says, "This is *wholly unknown:* Alexander VII. condemned

[k] Natalis Alex. Dissert. xlv. in Sæc. iv.
[l] Benedict. xiv. De Sacrificio Missæ, p. 128. ed Ferrariæ, 1767.
[m] Benedict. *ubi supra,* p. 77.
[n] Tournely De Deo, t. i. p. 582.

the following proposition, 'An annual legacy left for a soul, does not last longer than ten years.' St. Augustine recommended his mother thirty years after her death to the sacrifices and prayers of his readers: the Church celebrates anniversaries appointed many ages before for certain souls in particular. Therefore it may be that souls remain for a great length of time in Purgatory, and many interpret those words of St. Peter (1 Ep. iii. 19, 20,) 'By which also he went and preached to the spirits in prison, which were some time unbelieving, when once they waited for the long-suffering of God, in the days of Noe, when the ark was preparing,' of the souls detained in Purgatory from the time of the Deluge, to the descent of Christ into hell, that is, *for two thousand years and upwards.*'[o] Thus it is evident, that, according to the received Romish doctrine, the time spent in Purgatory by the souls of the just is of an unknown length, and may extend to many thousands of years.

III. It is a matter of debate amongst Romish theologians, whether the souls detained in Purgatory are not *tortured by devils.* "It is uncertain," says Bouvier, "whether the devils torture the righteous in Purgatory; some grave theologians with St. Thomas, deny it; but St. Bernard affirms it, whose opinion is favoured by the liturgies, in which God is entreated to deliver those souls from the lion's mouth."[p] Cardinal Bellarmine observes that the doctrine is uncertain, because the schoolmen with St. Thomas, deny it; but "on the other hand, that the souls in Purgatory are tortured by devils, is taught by *many revelations,* as that of St. Furseus in Beda, lib. ii. c. 19, and in Dionysius Carthusianus," &c.[q]

IV. I have now only to add that it is the doctrine of the Roman Church and of all your theologians, that Purgatory receives only the souls of the just, i. e. of those persons who die in a state of justification and grace, free from the guilt of mortal sin.

The Council of Trent distinctly intimates that "after the *grace of justification* is received," temporal penalties for sin remain to be endured in this world or in *Purgatory.*[r] The Catechism of the Council describes it as "a fire in which the souls of the *pious,* being tortured for a certain time, are expiated."[s]

[o] Bouvier, De Pœnit. p. 287.

[p] Bouvier, p. 286.

[q] Bellarminus De Purgatorio, lib. ii. c. xiv.

[r] Si quis post acceptam justificationis gratiam, cuilibet peccatori pœnitentia ita culpam remitti, ut reatum æternæ pœnæ deleri dixerit, ut nullus remaneat reatus pœnæ temporalis exsolvendæ vel in hoc sæculo vel in futuro in Purgatorio, antequàm ad regna cœlorum aditus patere possit; anathema sit. Conc. Trid. Sess. vi. can. 30.

[s] Præterea est purgatorius ignis, quo piorum animæ ad definitum

Bossuet says that "those who depart this life in this *state of grace and charity*, but without having discharged their debt of temporal punishment reserved by the Justice of God, suffer that punishment in the other life."[t] Perrone says: "By the word 'Purgatory' we mean a state of expiation, to endure for a time, in which *just souls* . . . are detained."[u] Tournely, Bouvier, Delahogue, and all your other Divines, employ exactly the same language.

Having thus ascertained what doctrines on the subject of Purgatory are received, approved, and authorized in the Roman Communion, though they have not been formally defined by the Council of Trent, we are in a position to explain to you the reasons for which the public in this country so strongly object to the doctrine in question.

"I am at a loss to conceive," you say, "what can be considered in it repugnant to the *justice of God*, or to the ordinary ways of Providence; what can be found therein opposed to the moral law, in the remotest degree. The idea that God, besides condemning some to eternal punishment, and receiving others to eternal glory, should have been pleased to appoint a middle and temporary state, in which those who are not sufficiently guilty for the severer condemnation, nor sufficiently pure to enjoy the vision of His face, are for a time punished and purged, so as to be qualified for this blessing, assuredly contains nothing but what is most accordant to all we can conceive of His *justice*. . . . . What then, in God's name, is there in this doctrine, viewed simply in itself, that can make it so popular a theme of declamation against Catholics? The *anti-Scriptural* doctrine of Purgatory, as it is termed, is more frequently than almost any other of our less important dogmas, the theme of obloquy and misrepresentation."[x]

Let me endeavour to account to you for the feelings of which you complain, and at the same time to shew that they are just and well-founded.

In the first place, then, I would again draw your attention to the fact that Romanists most positively assert, that none but

tempus cruciatæ expiantur, ut eis in æternam patriam ingressus patere possit, in quam nihil coinquinatum ingreditur. Cat. Conc. Trid. pars i. art. v. c. 5.

t Bossuet, Eposition, c. vii.

u Perrone, Præl. Theol. vol. iii. p. 308. ed. Lovan. 1839.

x Wiseman, Controv. Lectures, ii. p. 52, 53.

the *just* or *righteous* are admitted into Purgatory. Its punishments are reserved exclusively for those who die without the guilt of mortal sin, and in a state of justification. The pains of Purgatory are supposed to be inflicted in order to satisfy the *justice* of God for the temporal punishment still remaining due for remitted mortal sin, or for venial sin still remaining. You will not dispute the correctness of this statement.

In the second place, let us consider what you believe to be the relation of the *just* to God, or what is implied in *justification*. According to the Council of Trent, then, "Justification is not merely remission of sin, but *sanctification*, and the renewal of the inner man by the voluntary reception of grace and Divine gifts; so that he who was unrighteous is made *righteous*, and the enemy becomes a *friend*, and an heir according to the hope of eternal life. . . . When a man is justified, and *united to Jesus Christ*, he receives, together with the remission of sins, the following gifts bestowed upon him at the same time, namely, *faith, hope, and charity*."[y]

Thus justification includes the gift of *sanctifying grace;* and according to Perrone, whose theology is taught in the University of Rome, "Sanctifying grace, which is usually called 'habitual,' is commonly defined as 'a supernatural gift of God, permanently inherent in the soul, by which a man is immediately and formally rendered *holy, just, pleasing to God, the adoptive Son of God*, capable of doing works deserving of eternal life, and an heir of the same.' From this definition *the whole system of Catholic doctrine*, with regard to the nature of this grace and *its effects*, is collected; as, first, that it is intrinsic to our souls, or closely adherent to them; secondly, that *it washes the soul from its defilement, and makes it refulgent with a sort of Divine beauty;* thirdly, that this sanctifying grace is *inseparable from justification*, which depends on it, since a sinner is, by one and the same act, *made just and holy*."[z]

When therefore, you speak of a *just* man—of one who has received the grace of justification, you mean that he is reconciled to God; holy; full of faith, hope, and charity; full of all-sanctifying grace; free from the defilement of sin; refulgent with the beauty of sanctity, a child of God, an heir of salvation, well-pleasing to God, united to Jesus Christ. There is in short no term applied by Scripture to the holy objects of God's love, which you do not believe applicable in all its fulness to the *just*. And yet, Sir, you hold that God consigns these his

[y] Concil. Trident. Sess. vi. cap. vii.
[z] Perrone, Præl. Theol. t. v. p. 210.

beloved children to the tortures of HELL, for a period, the extent of which you cannot in any way calculate! You believe that they are, perhaps for *thousands of years*, tortured in the same fire which torments the lost spirits; that they are enveloped in darkness, struggling in anxiety of mind; and in fine, perfectly "miserable." And this, Sir, is the representation you give of the mercy and justice of God. The *mercy* of God is, according to your doctrine, exhibited in demanding payment "even to the last farthing" for venial sins, and plunging the objects of His love into the torment of the damned, because they have departed this life without satisfying for some trivial fault. The *justice* of God is shewn by His exacting payment "even to the last farthing" for sins which He has *already pardoned*—and by imposing the tortures of the reprobate and of devils on those who are "just" and "holy," and "washed from all defilement," and whose souls are "refulgent with divine beauty!"

Can it be a matter of surprise even to yourself, that we reject such doctrine, as most highly injurious to God? I cannot understand how it is possible, that with such facts as these before the world, you can venture to appeal to our sense of the "*justice*" of God in connexion with the doctrine of Purgatory. You are "at a loss to conceive what can be considered in it repugnant to the justice of God." We are equally at a loss to imagine, how the justice of God can be believed by those who embrace the doctrine of Purgatory, as generally taught and held in the Church of Rome.

But further: according to your doctrine, the punishment of Purgatory is required by the unsatisfied JUSTICE of God. The *infinite* atonement offered by our Lord Jesus Christ is, it seems, insufficient to satisfy the demands of Divine Justice.

No: after that atonement has been applied to the soul, and has produced its full justification and sanctification, Divine Justice still remains unsatisfied! What then, we would ask, is the benefit of Christ's atonement for sin, if it does not satisfy the JUSTICE of God? If that justice be not satisfied by the merits of Christ applied in justification, we may say with the Apostle, "Your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." (1 Cor. xv. 18, 19.) The doctrine of Purgatory, therefore, subverts our hope of Salvation. It leaves the justified without any shield against the demands of infinite and awful justice. Let it not be alleged, in reply, that the justice of God is *partially* appeased by the merits of Christ applied in justification, but that it has further demands on us; for this still subverts our belief in the *infinite* value of Christ's atonement: it as-

sumes most unwarrantably, that the demands of *infinite* justice are capable of *division:* it leaves us in total uncertainty as to the amount of the demands which Divine justice may have upon us: in fine, in admitting that it has any demands on us at all, it shakes our confidence in the atonement of our Lord: it teaches us to look away from that atonement, and to place our confidence in other things which still remain, to save us from the tremendous inflictions of a justice and a wrath which not even the death of the incarnate Deity could appease! Oh, how frail, how fearful is this hope! How would the repentant and justified sinner shudder to find himself on the brink of this precipice, with the tortures of HELL before him, and with nothing to satisfy the demands of Divine justice—nothing to appease the terrors of Divine wrath, except some of his own works and observances in the few years of sin and infirmity which he spends in this life! What can be the value of those breathings and actings of a worm? Can they satisfy that justice which God Himself, "manifest in the flesh," has failed to satisfy? Can they afford any ground of hope, when the *very sacrifice* of Christ, from which they derive whatever worth they may claim, is itself pronounced insufficient to meet the demands of divine justice?

But this, Sir, is not the whole of your received doctrine on the point. I have already shewn that you, and all Romish theologians teach, *as a matter of course*, that temporal punishments inflicted on the justified, whether in this world or in Purgatory, are necessary to appease the "wrath," the "anger," and the "vengeance" of an offended God.[a] You believe, therefore, that God is full of wrath and revenge towards the souls in Purgatory; and yet you believe, as I have shewn in this letter, that those very souls are just, holy, full of faith, hope, and charity; well-pleasing to God, and refulgent with divine beauty! Is not this something like blasphemy? I am sure that Romanists have no *intention* whatever to teach any doctrines which can be in any degree injurious to God. I am equally certain that they rarely think of comparing the doctrine of Purgatory with that of Justification. But the result of their doctrine is simply this: *that the Saints are pursued by the Divine hatred and revenge!* I would now ask you, whether you can much wonder at the repugnance with which your doctrine of Purgatory is viewed; and I would still more solemnly and earnestly enquire, whether it is possible that such a doctrine can be true?

[a] Letter II. p. 39—41.

Your writers endeavour to obviate the prejudice which must be excited against the doctrine of Purgatory when understood, by representing that the punishment thus inflicted, is, after all, somewhat milder than that of hell; for as Dens says, "It is much alleviated by the friendship of God and the certainty of obtaining glory, and by resignation to the most just will of God."[b] But let me ask, how can those souls feel consolation from the "friendship" of God, when, according to your doctrine, they are still subjects of His "justice," His "wrath," His "anger," and His "vengeance?" And what reason is there to maintain that souls in Purgatory are "certain of obtaining glory," when the "justice" of God, which demands *eternal* punishment, still remains unsatisfied? It is imagined that their future happiness is made known to them by revelation in their particular judgment after death, and before the general judgment; and that such souls know that they have continued in a state of grace and will therefore be finally saved. But Sir, according to your received doctrine, they know equally well, that they are subject to the demands of God's *justice* and *wrath;* and they have just as much reason therefore to think, that they shall be saved for a time, and finally punished; as to think that they shall be punished for a time and finally saved. In short, Sir, "resignation" is the only consolation remaining to such souls; and easy as it may be to be resigned to the inflictions of a *loving* Father—a *reconciled* God; it is not so easy to feel resignation under the punishments of an *angry* and *wrathful* God. If it were so, we might suppose that the punishments of the damned and of devils may be alleviated by resignation. No: resignation was never intended to be exercised in diminishing the demands of *justice* and of *vengeance*. It is in vain, therefore, that any attempt is made to draw distinctions between the punishments of Hell and of Purgatory; and this attempt is at once entirely and utterly subverted, by the direct assertions of Benedict XIV., Bellarmine, Cajetan, Dens, and others, that the punishment of Purgatory "IS THE VERY SAME AS THAT OF HELL, its eternity only being removed."

The answer of Romanists to all this may be readily anticipated. They will exclaim: "This is not our *belief:* it has never been defined by the Church: it is no where to be found written in express terms in the Council of Trent: we are therefore not *required* to *believe* it." In this manner they would gladly relieve themselves from the imputation of such errors, and from the legitimate prejudices which they are calculated to excite.

[b] Dens, Theol. lib. vii. p. 354.

But they cannot escape under these pretexts; for I admit indeed that the whole mass of doctrine on Purgatory which has been produced, has not been formally defined by the Council of Trent, and therefore that it is not strictly *de fide* in the Roman obedience; but I assert, on the authority of their most eminent divines, that the doctrines I have adduced, are, *in fact generally, if not universally, received, held and acted on in their Communion—that they are received without censure or disapprobation from any authority—and that any Romanist who openly opposed or censured them, would be liable to censure from authority.* I would in short ask, Whether any Romanist is now prepared to censure or publicly reject any of the above doctrines? Will he anathematize or even censure the doctrine, that the souls of the righteous are tortured in Purgatory—that they are struggling in fiery tortures—that they suffer torments of sense—that the pains they suffer are most horrible, and far beyond any that are endured in this life—that they differ from the tortures of hell chiefly in duration—that this torture is of unknown length, and may continue for thousands of years—that it is exacted by God's justice, after sin has been pardoned—that it is inflicted by an angry God on the justified? No, Sir: neither you, nor any other Romanist will venture to uplift your voice against this doctrine, although it is not contained in the decrees of Trent. It is therefore the *doctrine* of Romanists—the *received and approved doctrine* in their Communion; though it may not be *de fide;* and therfore they cannot escape from it, or persuade us that it is not really their doctrine. Let us see it openly disputed and denied, with impunity, by Romanists; and then, but not till then, will we exonerate them from the charges to which it gives rise.

§ 3. *Romish Proofs from Theological Reasons and Scripture, refuted.*

Let us now come to your arguments in proof of the doctrine of Purgatory.

I. The first and leading argument of all your theologians is, that "since temporal punishments are due to Divine justice for remitted sins, such punishments, if not averted by satisfactions in this world, must be endured in Purgatory."

I have already shewn that the foundations of this argument are perfectly untenable. It has been proved in Letters II. and III., that the doctrine of temporal penalties being due to God's justice for *remitted sin,* is unsupported by Revelation, opposed to the word of God, contradictory to sound doctrine, inconsistent

with the doctrine of the Roman Church herself. I have further proved in Letters III. and IV., that satisfactions or penitential works for *remitted* sins, are not required by God. Hence it follows, as a matter of course, that the above argument of your writers for Purgatory is wholly unavailing; and we are entitled to reverse it in the following manner.

According to the Gospel, the Divine justice is satisfied, and the anger of God is appeased, when sin has been remitted by the infinite merits of Christ applied by true repentance, (comprising contrition, confession, and works of repentance.) Consequently, no further *penalties* can be exacted by Divine *justice* or *anger* from the justified believer; and therefore he has no debt of satisfaction to pay in this life or another; although he may be afflicted by God for his greater sanctification, and is always bound to live a life of humility, watchfulness, and self-denial.

II. There is another favourite argument of all your theologians, which I shall (merely for the sake of convenience) give in your own words "No one will venture to assert that all sins are equal before God—that there is no difference between those cold-blooded and deliberate acts of crime which the hardened villain perpetrates, and those smaller and daily transgressions into which we habitually, and almost inadvertently, fall. At the same time, we know that God cannot bear to look on iniquity, however small; that He requires whatever comes into His presence to be perfectly pure and worthy of Him; and we might rationally conclude that there should be some means, whereby those who are in the middle state of offence, between deep and deadly transgressions on the one hand, and a state of perfect purity and holiness on the other, may be dealt with according to the just measure of His justice."[c] "We are assured in the new Law, that 'nothing defiled shall enter into the heavenly Jerusalem.' Rev. xxi. 27. Suppose then, that a Christian dies, who had committed some slight transgression: he cannot enter Heaven in this state, and yet we cannot suppose that he is to be condemned for ever. What alternative then are we to admit? Why, that there is some place in which the soul will be purged of the sin, and qualified to enter into the glory of God."[d]

This, Sir, is the palmary argument of all your writers in support of the doctrine of Purgatory. They all contend, with you, that those who die after having committed some of those smaller transgressions, defects, or faults, which you call *venial*

[c] Controv. Lectures, vol. ii. p. 52, 53.
[d] Ibid. p. 57.

sins, cannot be admitted into Heaven, into which "nothing defiled" can enter; and consequently that they must be purified from the guilt of those venial sins in Purgatory.

Let us now consider for a moment what your opinions are with regard to venial sin, and whether you really consider it to be sin *at all*, properly speaking. It is the doctrine of the Council of Trent, that, for sins committed after baptism, the sacrament of penitence is the divinely appointed remedy; "If any one "saith, that penitence is not truly and properly a sacrament in- "stituted by Christ our Lord for reconciling the faithful to God "*as often as they fall into sins* after baptism; let him be Ana- "thema."[e] The same doctrine is taught by the Catechism of the Council. "After the baptismal innocence is lost, unless "one takes refuge in penitence, without doubt, his salvation "should be despaired of."[f] According to Perrone, penitence as a sacrament is universally defined 'A sacrament instituted "by Christ the Lord, in which, by the authoritative absolution "of the priests, a man who is contrite, and has confessed, re- "ceives *remission of his sins* committed after baptism.'"[g] The same definition is given by Tournely,[h] Bouvier,[i] Dens, and your other theologians and writers. Hence therefore it is plain, that you believe the sacrament of penance to be the divinely-appointed mode of obtaining remission of *sins* committed after baptism.

It is also certain that you do not believe that venial sins are properly or necessarily the subject of this sacrament. You believe that they are a *sufficient* subject; i. e. that a person may, if he wishes, confess venial sins, and receive absolution for them; but you do not consider it necessary to do so.[k] It is the judgment of your theologians that, although the Canon of the Lateran Synod *Omnis utriusque sexûs*, renders it absolutely incumbent on every member of your Communion to confess *all his sins* once in the year, yet, nevertheless, it is not incumbent on those who are conscious only of *venial sins* to confess them;[l] and that a priest is bound to administer the Eucharist without exacting any previous confession, if the petitioner declares that he is only guilty of venial sin.[m]

[e] Concil. Trident. Sess. xiv. c. i.
[f] Cat. Conc. Tridentini, pars ii. De Pœn. Sacramento.
[g] Perrone, Præl Theol. t. vi. p. 366.
[h] Tournely, De Pœnit. t. i. p. 10.
[i] Bouvier, De Pœnit. p. 7.
[k] Dens, Theologia, t vi. p. 7; Ligorio, Theol. Moral. t. vi. p. 45-79; Tournely, De Pœnit. t. i. p. 102; Bouvier, De Pœnit. p. 32 Perrone, *ubi supra*, p. 455.
[l] Ligorio, Theologia Moral. t. vi. p. 319.
[m] Ibid. p. 318.

Now, Sir, we may fairly conclude from this, that the Roman Church herself does not believe that venial sin is properly and really sin at all. St. Thomas, according to Tournely, thinks that "repentance, really and properly so called, is not necessary for the remission of venial sins, but a *virtual* displeasingness in this life, or the pain of Purgatory in another."[n] The Council of Trent itself declares, that venial sins may be remitted in many ways besides by penitence;[o] and Tournely[p] and Dens[q] (after St. Thomas Aquinas) consider the repetition of the Lord's Prayer, knocking on the breast, the sprinkling of holy water, a Bishop's or a Priest's blessing, and other similar matters, quite sufficient to remove the guilt of venial sin. Ligorio, after Aquinas, affirms, that "any motion of grace or charity" remits venial sin.[r] It is evident, then, that venial sin is, in your opinion, a very slight and trifling fault, failing, infirmity, or imperfection, rather than a real sin. If you believed it a sin, strictly speaking, you would apply the remedy which you believe God to have instituted for the remission of sin, and would oblige your people to confess it every year.

But besides this, you believe that venial sin is perfectly consistent with a state of justification and grace; and consequently, as I have shewn, you are firmly convinced, that notwithstanding a justified person may have committed venial sin, he is nevertheless "*holy, just, well-pleasing to God, united to Christ, endowed with the grace of sanctification, refulgent with Divine beauty.*"

So then your doctrine comes to this: That those who are full of *holiness and of all heavenly graces*, are, on account of some *trifling failings, which do not even require repentance*, to be tortured in Purgatory, with the punishment of devils, for an unknown length of time! Is this your representation of the justice of God?

And you also maintain, that those who are thus holy, thus sanctified, thus *united to Christ*, are unworthy to be received into heaven! Yes: because it is written, that "there shall in no wise enter into it *any thing that defileth*, neither whatsoever worketh "abomination, or maketh a lie; but they which are "written in the Lamb's book of life;" (Rev. xxi. 27.) You assert, that the justified who die after the commission of some trivial fault are unfit to enter Heaven. The "justified" then,

[n] Tournely, De Deo, t. i. p. 623.
[o] Concil. Trid. Sess. xiv. c. v.
[p] Tournely, De Pœnit. t. i. p. 104.
[q] Dens, Theol. t. vi. p. 39.
[r] Ligorio, *ubi supra*, p. 44.

according to you, are defiled! The "holy" are defiled! The "members of Christ" are defiled! The "children of God" are defiled! They are too impure to be received into Heaven; and yet they are not too impure to be "members of Christ." They are fit to be "*members* of Christ," but they are so defiled that they cannot be permitted to enter His *presence*. Was there ever known such an absurd, such a monstrous, such a contradictory doctrine? If no one shall be received into Heaven that "maketh *a lie*," those who uphold this doctrine may well tremble. Those who would consign to the tortures of hell the holy and glorious objects of God's love, are themselves guilty of a *mortal* sin against the God of truth, of mercy, and of charity.

III. Romanists appeal in the next place to the Holy Scriptures. I shall again avail myself without scruple of your words.

(1.) "There is a passage with which, probably, most who "have looked into this subject are well acquainted. It is in the "second book of Maccabees (chapter xii.) where we are told how "Judas, the valiant commander, made a collection, and 'sent "twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice, "to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and reli- "giously concerning the resurrection.' For if he had not ho- "ped that they that were slain should rise again, it would have "seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead. It is, "therefore, a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, "that they may be loosed from their sins. (xii. 43—46.) .... "It proves therefore, that, at the time of the Maccabees, the "conviction existed, that when prayers were offered for the "dead, they were beneficial to them, and that it was 'a holy "and wholesome thought to pray for the dead.'"[8]

In commenting on this argument of all your writers, let me first observe, that the persons for whose sins these sacrifices and prayers were made, had been slain in battle (verse 34); and that when Judas and his company came to bury them, "under "the coats of every one that was slain, they found things con- "secrated to the idols of the Jamnites, which is forbidden the "Jews by the Law. Then every man saw that *this was the* "*cause wherefore they were slain*." (verse 40.)

From this it appears that the cause for which these people were slain, was their possession of what was "accursed" by the Law, (1 Deut. vii. 25, 26.) and their symbolizing with idolaters, offences to which the extreme penalty of death was

[8] Wiseman, Controv. Lectures, ii. 54, 55.

awarded by the law of God. They were thus guilty of *mortal* sin. If therefore, this passage correctly states the tenets of the Jews at that time, it proves that they believed it lawful to pray for the pardon of those who died in *mortal sin*—and therefore either they or you must be in error, for you hold it inconsistent with the Catholic faith to pray for those who die in mortal sin. Your writers allege that the sin was venial in this case, because those who were slain were ignorant that they were in possession of things offered to idols; but this is purely conjectural; and had it been the case, these persons could not have been punished with *death*, without having committed any real sin which deserved it. It is contended by Romanists, that as the custom of praying for the dead, here mentioned, existed among the Jews in our Saviour's time, and was not *reproved* by him, it must be lawful. What is this but to condemn your own doctrine on the subject? If it were lawful, in the opinion of the Jews, to pray for those who had died suddenly in mortal sin, and if our Saviour did not reprove this view, then it follows that Christians ought to imitate their example. Nevertheless you refuse to do so, and pronounce it wrong. So that your own doctrine and practice are condemned by the passage you have adduced in their favour.

Remember that I am not here contending against the practice of prayer for the departed faithful, as it was allowed in the primitive Church. I am merely denying that this passage of the Maccabees can afford any support to your belief, that the *justified* who are *free from mortal sin*, are in a state of torment in another life.

(2.) Romanists next appeal to the New Testament. "Our "blessed Saviour, on one occasion, distinguishes two kinds of "sin, and calls one a sin against the Holy Ghost, saying, "'Whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it "shall be forgiven him; but he that shall speak against the "Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, either in this world, "or in the next.' Matt. xii. 32. Here is a species of sin, the "aggravated nature of which is expressed by its not being for-"given in the next world. Should we not thence conclude, "some other sins may be forgiven there? Why give this pe-"culiar characteristic to one, if no sin is ever pardoned in the "next world? Assuredly, we have a right to conclude that "there is some remission of sin there; and yet it cannot be "either in Heaven, or in the place of eternal punishment. "We must therefore admit some other state in which this may "be."

Now, Sir, admitting that such a conclusion may *possibly* be drawn from our Saviour's words, I have yet to learn that such a *possibility* is sufficient to found an article of Catholic Faith. It may be that such a doctrine was meant to be taught by these words, or it may be that our Lord had no such intention; for surely you do not mean to say that your conclusion follows as a matter of *necessity* from this text—that because Christ says that a certain sin *shall not* be forgiven in this world or in the next, *therefore* there are sins which *will* be forgiven in the next world. You must see, that conclusions gathered in this way from texts which do not *necessarily* infer them, are wholly insufficient to prove articles of faith. It is very true that St. Augustine argues with you from this text, that some sins will be remitted in the world to come; but he adds, with becoming caution; "Concerning this thing, since it is a most deep question, "no precipitate opinion is to be formed."[t] And if St. Gregory the Great also makes use of the same argument,[u] I must beg to remind you, that according to the received doctrine of all your theologians, the sentiment of one or two of the Fathers is quite insufficient to constitute an article of faith. On the other hand, many of the Fathers understand the expression of our Lord, that this sin "shall not be forgiven him in this world or in the "next," as simply equivalent to saying, that it *never* shall be remitted. This may be collected from St. Jerome,[x] Chrysostom,[y] Theophylact,[z] Hilary of Poictiers,[a] Theophilus of Antioch,[b] Dionysius, Carthusianus,[c] &c.; and therefore there is nothing unreasonable in our adopting that interpretation, more especially as our Lord is represented in the other Gospels as actually using the word "never" to express his meaning more fully. But besides this, the text, as interpreted by Romanists, goes to establish a doctrine which they do not themselves believe; i. e. that sin in general may be remitted in another world; and consequently that those who die in *mortal sin,* may be pardoned after death. You will answer in a moment, that the text only refers to the *temporal punishment* due to *remitted* mortal sin, or to *venial sins.* But where, I would ask, have

[t] De qua re, quoniam profundissima quæstio est, non est modò præcipitanda sententia. August. lib. vi. cont. Julian. c. 15. t. x.
[u] Gregor. Mag. Dialog. lib. iv. c. 39.
[x] Hieron. Comment. in S. Matt. Oper. t. ii. p. 50.
[y] Chrysost. Oper. t. vii. p. 449. ed. Benedict.
[z] Theophylact. Comment. in IV. Evang. *in loc.* Paris, 1631.
[a] Hilarius Pictav. Opera, p. 671. ed. Benedict.
[b] Theophil. Antioch. Comment. in. IV. Evang. lib. i. Bibl. Patr. i. p. 874.
[c] Dionys. Carthus. *in loc.*

you learnt this? What authority have you for thus forcing the text to suit your own purposes? The text says nothing of "temporal punishments" or of "venial sins;" it simply and broadly speaks of "sin;" and if you are entitled to limit its meaning to suit your own purposes, why do you not also limit the words of our Lord, "whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted?" and say that they only confer the power of remitting "temporal penalties" or "venial sins?"

(3.) We next come to the famous text; "Other foundation "can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. "Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be "made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall "be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work "of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath "built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's "work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall "be saved; yet so as by fire." (1. Cor. iii. 11—15.)

This passage, which so many of your writers advance in proof of the doctrine of Purgatory, does not seem to you or to Perrone to have much weight. The reasons for this are supplied by Tournely[d] and Natalis Alexander,[e] from whom we learn, that although many persons understand the text in the sense usually given to it by modern Romanists, yet St. Augustine himself confesses that it is obscure and difficult to understand; and he says that "he should prefer to hear persons of more understanding and wisdom" on that subject.[f] Bellarmine observes, that there are many points in this text on which interpreters do not agree. First, what is meant by the builders; 2. what by gold, silver, and precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; 3. what by the day of the Lord; 4. what by the fire which shall try every man's work. It appears that Chrysostom, Theodoret, and the Greek Fathers, understand the fire here spoken of to be the *eternal* fire of hell, while St. Augustine and St. Gregory the Great believe that it signifies only the tribulations of this life.[g] In conclusion Natalis Alexander and Tournely remark, that amidst such various expositions of interpreters, Purgatory can only be deduced *probably* from this text, not demonstratively. It is plain, therefore, that we need not trouble ourselves in discussing with you the meaning of this passage.

d Tournely, De Deo, t. i. p. 590.
e Natalis Alexander, Dissert. xlv. in Hist. iv. seculi.
f Augustinus, lib. de Fide et Operibus, cap. xvi.
g Bellarmin. De Purgatorio, lib. ii. cap. v.

(4.) There is another text which is in much favour with some Romanists, and which we may as well consider here. I allude to the well known passage in the first epistle of St. Peter: "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just "for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to "death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit. By which also "he went and preached unto the Spirits in prison; which some "time were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God "waited in the days of Noe." (1 Pet. iii. 18—20.)

How the doctrine of Purgatory is to be deduced from this, it is not easy to see. It is very true that a "prison" is here mentioned, but the inhabitants of this prison were those who were *disobedient* in the days of Noah, and we have no right hence to infer that the *justified* or *obedient* are cast into any prison after death, more especially when it is considered that we are now under a different dispensation from that under which these souls were in prison, and that no conclusive argument can be drawn from their condition to ours.

(5.) As to that text which other writers of yours quote, "I "tell thee, thou shalt not come out thence, till thou hast paid "the last farthing," (Luke xii. 59,) I need only refer to Natalis Alexander, one of your most approved theologians, who observes that "this place does not demonstrate Purgatory;" for according to St. Augustine, the "adversary" who accuses us to the judge, is the Law of God; while St. Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, &c. believe that it signifies any one whom we have injured, and who complains to God against us; and that the prison here mentioned is *Hell*, from which the sinner shall *never* escape. This is also the interpretation of St. Augustine.[h] It is plain, therefore, that no argument for Purgatory can be deduced from this text, as Natalis Alexander remarks.

As for the other passages of Scripture which various writers have adduced in support of Purgatory, I refer you to the writer last mentioned, who has sufficiently shewn their insufficiency.

§ 4. *Romish Proofs from Tradition, refuted.*

We now come to your arguments from tradition in support of the doctrine of Purgatory.

It would be impossible in a short Tract to examine all the passages which have been adduced in proof of the doctrine of Purgatory. I shall therefore content myself with noticing those which you have yourself selected from the "Faith of Catho- "lics,"[i] as bearing most strongly on the point.

[h] This is proved by Natalis Alexander, *ubi supra*.
[i] Controv. Lectures, vol. ii. p. 59—63.

We are first referred to Tertullian's statement that a Christian widow "prays for the soul of her husband, entreating re-"pose for him, and participation in the first resurrection."[k] This will not aid you, for the mere circumstance of her entreating repose or rest for him, does not imply that he was not actually in the enjoyment of that "rest which remaineth for the "people of God." We pray for those who are in a state of grace in this world, that they may have faith, hope, and charity; meaning to express our desire that those graces may be *continued* and *increased*. So also the Christian widow meant to pray that her husband might *continue* in his "rest" and that it might be *augmented*. There is not the slightest reason to suppose that she believed him to be in a state of *suffering*.

St. Cyprian states that his predecessors "advised that no "brother, departing this life, should nominate any Churchman "his executor; and should he do it, that no oblation should be "made for him, nor sacrifice offered for his repose."[l] And it is hence argued, that "it was considered a severe punishment, "that prayers and sacrifices should not be offered up for those "who had violated any of the ecclesiastical laws."[m]

A *punishment* it certainly was—a mark of reprobation on the memory of the deceased—an exclusion from the ordinary offices of Christian love and honour at that time. But you will in vain look here for any intimation of a belief that the souls of the departed faithful were in any *torment*.

We are next referred to Origen, and informed that "no "one can be clearer regarding this doctrine." Origen says: "When we depart this life, if we take with us virtues or vices, "shall we receive reward for our virtues, and those trespasses "be forgiven to us which we knowingly committed; or shall we "be punished for our faults, and not receive the reward of our "virtues! Neither is true; because we shall suffer for our sin, "and receive the reward of our good actions .... Would you "enter into Heaven with your wood, and hay, and stubble, to "defile the kingdom of God; or, on account of those incum-"brances, remain without, and receive no reward for your gold, "and silver, and precious stones? ... It is manifest that, in "the first place, the fire destroys the wood of our transgres-"sions, and then returns to us the reward of our good works."[n]

[k] Tertull. de Monogamia, c. 10.
[l] Cypr. Ep. xlvi. p. 114.
[m] Lectures, p. 59.
[n] Origen. Hom. xvi. al. xii. in Jerem. t. iii. p. 231, 232. ed. Bened.

On this passage I would beg to quote to you the note of the Benedictine editors of Origen, derived from the writings of the learned Huet, Bishop of Avranches. "Not only in this place "but in a multitude of others, Origen establishes a Purgatory; "but *in his own way*, that is to say, that no other fire or pun- "ishments torture souls, but those that are *purgatorial or* "*temporary*." In fact Origen denied the eternity of future punishments; as St. Augustine remarks in his book on heresies; and the doctrine of which you so highly approve is styled by this great Father "a most vain impiety," which Origen had learned from the heathen philosophers, and which St. Augustine refuted in his works.[o] It was also condemned as a heresy by the fifth Œcumenical Synod.[p] The passage, then, is throughout *heretical;* and you venture to appeal to these *condemned heresies* as affording "clear" proofs of your doctrine!

We are next referred to the language of St. Basil, who, in commenting on the words of Isaiah, "Through the wrath of "the Lord is the land burned," says, that "the things which "are earthly shall be made the food of a punishing fire: to the "end that the soul may receive favour and be benefited;" and that there is there no "threat of extermination, but it denotes "expurgation, according to the saying of the Apostle: If any "man's work burn, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be "saved, yet so as by fire."[q] I have only to remark, that it is, I think impossible for any one to read the passage, without perceiving that St. Basil in this place was speaking only of the temporal tribulations of the Jews *in this life*, and that he did not make the slighest allusion to the doctrine of Purgatory.

St. Ephrem of Edessa is cited, as asking his brethren to pray for him after his departure, and as maintaining that "the dead "are helped by the offerings of the living."[r] This merely refers to the practice of praying for the dead; it determines nothing as to their condition. You also quote the following words: "If also the sons of Mattathias who celebrated their

[o] Quis enim Catholicus Christianus vel doctus vel indoctus non vehementer exhorreat, eam quam dicit (Origenes) purgationem malorum, id est etiam eos qui hanc vitam in flagitiis et facinoribus et sacrilegiis atque impietatibus quamlibet maximis finierunt, ipsum etiam postremò Diabolum atque angelis ejus, quamvis post longissima tempora, purgatos atque liberatos regno Dei lucique restitui . . De qua vanissima impietate adversus philosophos à quibus ista didicit Origenes, in libris de Civitate Dei diligentissimè disputavi . . . August. Lib. de Hæres. c. xliii t. viii. Oper. ed. Bened. p. 13.

[p] Natalis Alexander, Hist. Eccl. t. iii. p. 603.

[q] Basil. Com. in cap. ix. Isai. t. i. p. 554.

[r] In Testament. t. ii. p. 234; p. 371. edit. Oxon.

"feasts in figure only, could cleanse those from guilt by their "offerings who fell in battle, how much more shall the priests "of Christ aid the dead by their oblations and prayers."[s] This latter passage is of very doubtful authority, for it does not appear in any of the Greek manuscripts of Ephrem's works, and is only found in the Syriac.[t]

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, it is said, asserts, "that the souls of "those for whom the prayers are offered, receive very great "*relief* while this holy and tremendous victim lies upon the "altar,"[u] i. e. in the holy Eucharist. I would observe in the first place, that the word used is ωφελιαν "profit" or "advantage" —not "relief;" and next, that the passage merely proves the existence of the practice of prayer for the departed.

St. Gregory of Nyssa is cited as teaching, that "God allows "man to remain subject to what himself has chosen; that hav- "ing tasted of the evil which he desired . . . and in *this life* "being renovated by prayers and the pursuit of Divine wisdom, "*or in the next*, being expiated by the purging fire, he might "recover the state of happiness which he had lost."[x] I need not copy the remainder of the passage, which teaches throughout the same doctrine, namely, that of Origen, that persons who have committed sins in this life, will be purged from them by temporary punishments in another. These passages were doubtless interpolated by the Origenist heretics, and Dom Ceillier remarks, that there is not one of the works of Gregory of Nyssa which the heretics have so much altered, as that in which these passages are found.[y] You have therefore in this instance also, been only tracing the conformity of Romanism with heresies condemned by the Catholic Church.

The next quotation professes to be from St. Ambrose,[z] but the work in which it is contained is rejected as spurious by the Benedictine editors of St. Ambrose, and it is generally supposed by critics to be the work of Hilary, a deacon of the Roman Church who was involved in the schism of Lucifer of Cagliari.[a] This writer, in commenting on the words "He shall be saved, yet so as by fire," says, "He will be saved . . . because his substance shall remain, while his bad doctrine shall perish. Therefore he said, 'yet so as by fire,' in order that his salvation

[s] Lectures, ii. 61.
[t] Ephrem. Syri Opera, t. ii. p. 239. 401. ed. Assemani.
[u] Cyril. Cateches. Mystag. ix. x. p. 328.
[x] Greg. Nyss. Orat. de defunctis, tom. ii. p, 1066, 1067, 1068.
[y] Ceillier, tom. viii. p. 365.
[z] Wiseman, Controv. Lectures, ii. 62.
[a] Natalis Alexander, Hist. Eccl. tom. iv. p. 150.

be not understood to be without punishment. He shews that he shall be saved indeed, but he shall undergo the punishment of fire, and thus purified, be 'saved by fire,' and not be like the unbelieving, tortured with eternal fire for ever; *so that in some sort it may be worth one's while to have believed in Christ.*"[b] From the above passage it may be inferred that this writer was of opinion that all those who profess to be Christians, will finally be saved, even though they may have taught erroneous doctrine in the present life. Such a doctrine however, which is censured by St. Augustine, is not that of the Catholic Church.

We now come to a genuine passage from St. Ambrose, in which he prays for the soul of the Emperor Theodosius, "Give, O Lord, rest to Thy Servant Theodosius, that rest "which Thou hast prepared for Thy Saints . . . I will not "leave him, till, by my prayers and lamentation, he shall be "admitted to the holy mount of the Lord, to which his deserts "call him."[c] We are to infer from this, I presume, that St. Ambrose believed the soul of Theodosius at that time to be in Purgatory suffering the torments remaining due to his sins. Was this really the case? The following extracts from the commencement of the very same funeral oration, will shew what was his view of the condition of the soul for which he prayed; and it will also suffice to explain all similar prayers in the writings of the Fathers, and in the ancient Liturgies. Theodosius, he says, "did not lay aside his kingdom (in death), "but changed it, having been brought, in virtue of his piety, to "the tabernacles of Christ, to that heavenly Jerusalem, where, "BEING NOW PLACED, he saith, 'As we have heard, so have "we seen in the city of the Lord of Hosts, &c.'"[d] He afterwards says, "Being therefore delivered from the doubtful con-"test, Theodosius of august memory NOW ENJOYS PERPETUAL "LIGHT, A LENGTHENED PEACE, and for those things which "he hath done in the body, REJOICES IN THE FRUITS OF THE "DIVINE REWARD."[e] Therefore St. Ambrose did not believe that the soul for which he prayed, was in Purgatory.

[b] Ut per ignem purgatus fiat salvus, et non sicut perfidi æterno igne in perpetuum torqueatur: ut ex aliqua parte operæ pretium sit credidisse in Christum. Ambrosiaster, Com. in 1 Ep. ad Cor. tom. ii. Append. p 122. Oper. Ambrosii ed. Benedict.

[c] Ambros. De Obitu Theodosii Oper. tom. ii. p. 1207, 8.

[d] Et ille quidem abiit accipere sibi regnum, quod non deposuit sed mutavit, in tabernacula Christi jure pietatis adscitus, in illam Hierusalem supernam, ubi nunc positus dicit, &c. Ambr. p. 1197.

[e] Absolutus igitur dubio certamine, fruiter nunc augustæ, memoriæ Theodosius luce perpetua, tranquillitate diuturnâ, et pro

A passage from St. Epiphanius is quoted, in which he says, that in prayers, "we mention both the just and *sinners*, in order *that from the latter we may obtain mercy.*"[f] There is no allusion to Purgatory in this passage: it merely shews the opinion of Epiphanius, which was also that of Chrysostom,[g] and of Augustine,[h] that the punishment of lost souls in the other world might be alleviated by the prayers of the Church. This is a doctrine which Romanists themselves do not receive.

With reference to the passage cited by you from St. Jerome, "As we believe the torments of the devil, and of those wicked "men, who said in their hearts 'there is no God,' to be eter- "nal; so, in regard to those sinners *who have not denied the "faith*, and whose works will be proved and purged by fire, "we conclude that the sentence of the Judge will be tempered "by mercy."[i] In this passage St. Jerome certainly does speak of a Purgatory; but it is one which is intended for the final purification of *professing Christians, however great may have been their sins*—a doctrine which is rejected by St. Augustine,[k] and by the Catholic Church. Even Romanists reject the doctrine of St. Jerome in this place.

We are next met by a passage from St. Augustine, that "the "prayers of the Church, or of some pious persons, are heard "for those who have been regenerated in Christ, whose life in "the body has not been so evil as to be judged unworthy of "such mercy, nor so good as to render such mercy unnecessary. "As also, after the resurrection, there shall be some to whom, "after punishments which the spirits of the dead suffer, mercy "shall be imparted, *that they be not cast into eternal fire.* "Otherwise it would not have been said of some, with truth, "that 'their sin shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor "in the world to come,' unless some sins were remitted in the "next world."[l]

This passage will not establish your doctrine, for St. Augustine is here speaking of persons who depart this life in sin, and who consequently are not in a state of justification: and he supposes that such sinners may receive pardon in the next life. But he is not speaking of THE JUST, who alone, according to the Romish doctrine, are consigned to Purgatory. This seems

iis quæ in hoc gessit corpore, remunerationis divinæ fructibus gratulatur. Ib. p. 1206.

[f] Hæres. lv. *sive* lxxv. tom. i. p. 911.

[g] Chrysostom. Hom. xxi. in Act. Hom. iii. in Ep. ad Phil

[h] Augustin. Enchirid. cap. cx.

[i] Hieron. Comment. in cap. lxv. Isai. tom. ii. p. 492.

[k] August. Enchirid. cap. lxvii.

[l] De Civitate Dei, lib. xxi. cap. 24. t. vii. p. 642.

evident from his language elsewhere, for he asserts that "the "souls of the *pious*, when separated from the body, ARE AT REST, "but those of the *impious* suffer punishment, until the bodies "of the former revive to eternal life, and of the latter to eternal "death."[m]

The last passage is also from St. Augustine,[n] as follows: "If they had built 'gold and silver, and precious stones,' they "would be secure from both fires; not only from that in which "the wicked shall be punished for ever, but likewise from that "fire which will correct those who are to be saved by fire. . . . "And because it is said 'he shall be saved,' therefore *that fire* "is despised. Yes, indeed, though they shall be saved by fire, "that fire will be more grievous than whatever a man can "suffer in this life."[o]

I have only to remark, that St. Augustine himself elsewhere interprets the fire here spoken of as signifying the tribulations of this life;[p] and that he acknowledges the texts of Scripture here referred to be obscure and difficult.[q] So that, on the whole, it is doubtful in what sense he understood the above text. It seems, however, that in this, as in the last passage, he is not speaking of THE JUSTIFIED, but of those who die in unrepented sin. Augustine says of the former: "It is unlawful to doubt "that the souls of the departed JUST AND PIOUS are living in "REST."[r]

As to the language of Isidore of Seville, in reference to the purifying fire, that it is "longer and sharper than any torments "which man can devise in the present life,"[s] I have only to say that the authority of this writer, who lived at the end of the sixth century, is of no great weight, and cannot suffice to establish an article of faith; but he expresses his doubts whether those who are penitent and justified at the end of life do not receive *at once* remission of their sins, without any purifying fire[t]

[m] In requie enim sunt animæ piorum à corpore separatæ; impiorum autem pœnas luunt, donec istarum ad æternam vitam, illarum vero ad æternum mortem, quæ secunda dicitur, corpora reviviscant. De Civit. Dei, lib. xiii. c. 8. t. vii. p. 330.

[n] Lectures, ii. 63; Remarks on Letter from Rev. W. Palmer, p. 79.

[o] Enarrat. in Psal. xxxvii. tom. iv. p. 295.

[p] Enchirid. cap. lxviii. tom. vi. p. 222.

[q] Lib. de fide et operibus, cap. 16. tom. vi. p. 180.

[r] Justorum ac piorum animæ defunctorum, quod in requie vivant, dubitare fas non est. Aug. De Civ. Dei, lib. xii. cap. ix.

[s] De Ordine Creaturarum, cap. xiv. cited in Remarks, p. 80.

[t] Ibid, apud Dacherii Spicileg. tom. i. p. 303.

The passage which you quote from St. Gregory of Nyssa, in your Remarks (p. 80), has been already noticed, (p. 25). It is of no authority, and was interpolated by the Origenist heretics.

These then are the best arguments which can be produced in favour of the doctrine of Purgatory. The errors of individual writers opposed to the Catholic doctrine, and the interpolations of heretics are obtruded on us as the voice of tradition. But no where do we find, even in the passages adduced, the doctrine of Romanists. No where do we find it said that the "just and "pious" are tortured for an indefinite time after this life with the punishments of the lost; or that this punishment is inflicted by the "unsatisfied justice" of an "angry" and "vindictive" God; or that tortures of the most horrible description are awarded to the most trivial faults which do not require repentance; or that the justified *members* of Jesus Christ are too polluted to be permitted to enter his presence. These are the doctrines received, approved, and authorized in your Communion, and which are entirely opposed to those of the Scriptures and of Catholic tradition.

§ 5. *The Catholic Doctrine opposed to Purgatory, confirmed by Scripture and Catholic Antiquity.*

It now only remains to establish the truth in opposition to the doctrine of Purgatory.

The belief of the Catholic Church in England, then, is expressed in the following prayer of her ritual: "Almighty God, "with whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in "the Lord, and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they "are delivered from the burden of the flesh, *are in joy and "felicity;* we give thee hearty thanks," &c. We therefore believe that the justified are, after this life, in rest and happiness; that they are not suffering any torments or afflictions; and that they await the Resurrection in joyful certainty of God's favour.

How consoling and encouraging is this doctrine to those who are buffeting the waves of temptation in this life, and toiling through the narrow and thorny path which leads to eternal glory! It enables them to look with hope to that moment when this doubtful contest shall be at an end, and when the liberated soul shall enter into the joy of its Lord—when the exile of this life shall be no more, and the holy, the pure, the humble spirit of the child of God, shall be received into the kingdom of its Eternal Father. Such a thought sheds so bright a splendour over death itself, that it is lost in the glory of victory. The Christian,

then, is stimulated by hope to prepare for death, knowing that he shall receive his reward as soon as this short life is over. How different would be his feeling if he believed that the torments of this life are greatly inferior to those which await him in another; that the few years which he spends on earth are insufficient for his purification; that he must, perhaps for *thousands of years* after this life, suffer the torments of Hell, and groan under the miserable feeling of alienation from his God. The argument of St. Paul, "this light affliction, which "is *but for a moment*, worketh for us a far more exceeding "and eternal weight of glory,"[u] would lose much of its force. He would look with anguish and terror to the end of life; though he might derive some poor consolation from the reflection, that at *some future time unknown to him*, his soul would be delivered from the tortures of Purgatory.

But the word of God strengthens us against such terrors by the unfailing assurances which it affords of God's love towards the justified—assurances which we do not feel warranted in *limiting* and *curtailing* as you do. We receive in all its length, and breadth, and depth, and height, that promise of Scripture, "There is therefore NO CONDEMNATION to them "which are in Christ Jesus"[x]—no condemnation to punishment, whether temporal or eternal. We believe that "being justified by his blood, we "shall be SAVED FROM WRATH through him"[y] —saved from his wrath here and hereafter. We are persuaded that "God hath not appointed us unto WRATH, but to obtain "salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that "WHETHER WE WAKE OR SLEEP we should LIVE TOGETHER WITH HIM."[z] And hence we believe, that the justified souls in Paradise are not subject to the wrath of God, but that they are in salvation, and are *living with Christ;* and therefore we reject with horror the notion that they are subjected to the penalties of the second death, even for a time. We believe that God will "withhold *no good thing* from them that walk up-"rightly;"[a] and therefore that he will not withhold from them peace and joy after this life. We know that he "*preserveth* "*the souls* of his saints,"[b] and therefore will not permit them to be tortured by the flames of Hell. We know that God "has "delivered us from the power of darkness;"[c] that Christ has declared, "He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness;"[d] and therefore we fear no dark and gloomy prison after this life, and no tortures from the inhabitants of darkness. We have the

[u] 2 Cor. iv. 17. [x] Rom. viii. 1. [y] Rom. v. 9. [z] 1 Thess. v. 10.
[a] Ps. lxxxiv. 11. [b] Ps. xcvii. 10. [c] Col. i. 13. [d] John viii. 12.

promise of God, "I will *never* leave thee or forsake thee:"[e] and how can we imagine that we shall be "left" to the torments of infernal fire? No: relying on him who has said: "with "everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee,"[f] we rely on his love after the soul and body shall be separated. We believe that if Christ has said "we will come unto him, and make our "abode with him,"[g] tortures after this life shall not be the lot of those who are glorified by the indwelling of God.

Surely a simple and unquestioning faith would teach us to feel with the Apostle: "To us to live is Christ, and to die is "*gain*,"[h] and "gain" implies *rewards*, not torments. It would oblige us to believe really that "there remaineth therefore a "*rest* unto the people of God."[i] It would compel us to acquiesce in the language of the pious, though uninspired author of the Book of Wisdom, that "the souls of the righteous are in the "hand of God, and then shall *no torment* touch them;"[k] and that "though the righteous be prevented with death, yet shall "he be *in rest*."[l] It would induce us to accept in all its fulness that consolatory declaration, "*Blessed* are the dead that die in "the Lord, *from henceforth;* yea, saith the Spirit, that they "may *rest* from their labours, and their works do follow "them."[m] It would teach us to dwell with happiness on the assurance of our Lord to the dying malefactor, "To-day shalt "thou be with me *in paradise;*"[n] beholding in this the immediate reward of the departing righteous. And when we read of the rich man in torments after this life, and of Lazarus in Abraham's bosom, we should, with Catholic Antiquity, see in the latter the *reward* of the righteous, even before the day of judgment.

And now it may be fairly enquired, How can you dispose of this multiform voice of Scripture, proclaiming peace, and rest, and joy, to believers, after this life? By what authority do you venture to consign those to *punishment*, whom the Scripture pronounces blessed—to subject those to Divine *justice* and *wrath*, whom the word of God declares the objects of his love? It is true that you explain away these passages. If rewards are promised, you say they are promised with a *reserve;* if rest and joy are promised, they arise only from a cessation of the toils of this present life, and are in some sense or other consistent with a residence in Purgatory. Nothing is impossible to ingenuity; no Scripture is incapable of perversion by the unstable and unlearned; but notwithstanding all distinctions, and evasions and subtleties, the meaning of the whole of Scripture evidently

[e] Hebrews xiii. 5. [f] Is. liv. 8. [g] John xiv. 23. [h] Phil. i. 21
[i] Heb. iv. 9. [k] Wisd. iii. 1. [l] Ib. iv. 7. [m] Rev. xiv. 13.
[n] Luke xxiii. 43.

is, that the justified are after this life subject to no torments; but that they repose in peace and joy; that they receive an immediate reward.

How deep and wide is the contrast between this and your doctrine. You consign the "justified," the "sanctified," the "members of Christ," bone "of his bone and flesh of his flesh," to punishments, and tortures, to anguish, to flames, to misery, to the wrath and vengeance of God. Death is with you the moment when the real afflictions and torments of the justified, infinitely worse than any which they have suffered in this life, commence; it is the entrance of the beloved children of God on a state where a vista of unknown length is filled with fire, and agonies, and torturing fiends.

Is this the doctrine which you pretend to have learned from Catholic antiquity? Did the Fathers believe that the sufferings of the righteous were enhanced and multiplied by death? Or did they agree with Scripture and with us, that death is a haven of rest to the wearied souls of the faithful; that they await their resurrection in peace, and joy; and that they repose in the bosom of their Saviour and their God? I am really at a loss how to select from the abundant evidence which the records of antiquity supply in confirmation of our doctrine, and in condemnation of yours. I shall however make the attempt.

I commence with Justin Martyr, who, near the beginning of his Dialogue with Trypho says, that "all souls do not die," but that, "the souls of the pious remain in some BETTER PLACE, "ἐν κρείττονί ποι χωρίῳ, , and the unrighteous and wicked in a *worse* "*place*, expecting the time of judgment." It is plain from this, that the doctrine of Purgatory was unknown at that time, for it is impossible to regard as "a better place" a region where tortures of the most dreadful character are inflicted.

I next turn to the venerable Irenæus Bishop of Lyons, who was acquainted with the contemporaries of the Apostles. "The "Lord," he says, "taught in the fullest manner, that souls "departing from the body—not only continue to exist without migrating from one body to another,—but to preserve the "same bodily appearance, in that narrative concerning the rich "man and Lazarus who was at rest in Abraham's bosom, in "which he saith that the rich man knew Lazarus after death, "and Abraham likewise; and that each of them remained "in his own order," that is, in a place of suffering or of happiness, "and that he requested him to send Lazarus to aid him "... For by this it is plainly declared that souls continue to "exist, .. and that *each people*," i. e. the good and the bad,

"receive a *fitting habitation* even before the day of judgment."[o] This is exactly our belief. We hold that the good receive reward, and the wicked punishment, immediately after this life.

Tertullian, in refuting the opinion of some persons who denied that the souls of the faithful descend into the region of departed spirits, remarks that they "proudly imagine that the souls "of the faithful do not deserve it, as if servants were above "their Lord, and disciples above their master. They disdain "perhaps to receive the consolation of *awaiting the resurrection* "*in Abraham's bosom.*"[p] The faithful then, according to this Father, are in Abraham's bosom, and at rest. And hence he held that "We do an injury to Christ when we hear without "equanimity that any have been called away by him, as if "they *deserved commiseration.* 'I desire,' said the Apostle, "'to be received presently, and to be with Christ.'"[q] There was evidently no notion at that time, that the souls of the departed believers were consigned to tortures, surpassing all that can be endured in this life.

The language of the blessed Martyr St. Cyprian, is still more remarkable, and clearly establishes our faith against the error of Romanists. He consoles the faithful at Carthage under the awful visitation of a pestilence, in the following manner, "Our country we believe to be Paradise: the Patriarchs we es- "teem to be our parents. Why then do we not speed and run, "that we may behold our country, and salute our parents? There "a great multitude of those who are dear to us, await us; a "numerous and abundant crowd of parents, brethren, children "*already secure of their own salvation,* yet still desirous of ours, "desire us. How great a joy for them and us in common to behold "and embrace them! *What pleasure of celestial kingdoms is* "*there, without fear of death; and with eternal life what great* "*and perpetual happiness! There is the glorious choir of the* "*Apostles; there the number of the rejoicing Prophets . . . There* "*are the merciful rewarded, &c.*"[r] Can any doubt remain after this, that the primitive Church believed the souls of the departed faithful to be in "the joy of their Lord;" and that they would have repelled with horror the notion, that they are consigned to torment, with the devil and his angels?

o Irenæus, adv. Hæres. lib. ii. cap. xxxiv ed. Bened.

p Quis satis superbè non putant animas fidelium inferis dignas, servi super dominum et discipuli super magistrum, aspernati si fortè in Abrahæ sinu, expectandæ resurrectionis solatium capere. Tertul. de Anima cap. lv. p. 304. Oper. ed. Rigaltii.

q Tert. de Patientia, cap. ix. p. 145.

r Cyprianus, De Mortalitate.

That the just and pious are reserved for torment after this life, was a doctrine wholly unknown to antiquity. The very writers who maintain that *sinners* will be saved by sufferings after this life, never thought of consigning the *justified* to the same punishment. Origen himself was a stranger to such a doctrine: "The soul," he says, "having its own substance "and life, *when it departs from this world*, shall be disposed of "according to its merits, enjoying *the inheritance of eternal "life and happiness if its actions shall have obtained it*, or "delivered to eternal fire and punishments if the guilt of its "crimes have thrust it into them."[s] "We have," he elsewhere says, "a great High-Priest . . . who hath promised to "those who rightly learn divine things and *live according to "them*, that he will raise them to heavenly places, for he saith, "That where I am there ye may also be. Therefore we hope, "that *after the labours and contests here below*, we shall *be in "the highest heavens*."[t] Whenever, in short, this Father speaks of the future destination of the righteous, he uses exactly the same terms that we should do. He never supposes them to be in any suffering whatever.

St. Methodius, Bishop of Pataræ A. D. 290, who was remarkable for his opposition to the errors of Origen, describes in the following terms the state of the departed faithful. "When "this short transitory life is dissolved, WE SHALL HAVE OUR "DWELLING WITH GOD, EVEN BEFORE THE RESURRECTION, "until we receive again our habitation (the body) renewed, "and stable, and never to fall."[u] It is clear from this, that the Primitive Church believed the souls of the just to be in happiness, for it would be impious to imagine that any torment can approach those who "dwell with God."

The Apostolical Constitutions, which appear to have been composed before the Council of Nice, furnish another proof of the continuance of the orthodox doctrine on this subject. In a prayer we find the following passages; "The spirits of all the "just are living with thee, and are in thine hand, *whom no "torment shall touch;* for all that are sanctified *are under "thine hand*."[x] How little notion was there at that time in the Church, that the pious and just go forth from this life, into sufferings far exceeding any that can be endured in this world;

[s] Origen. Præf. Lib de principiis, tom. i. Oper. ed. Bened. p. 48.
[t] Contra Celsum, lib vi. tom. i. p. 145.
[u] Methodius, De Resurrectione, apud Photii Biblioth. Cod. ccxxxiv. p. 921. ed. 1611.
[x] Τῶν δικαίων τὰ πνεύματα ἐν τῇ χειρί σου εἰσὶν, ὧν οὐ μὴ ἅψηται βάσανος. Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. xli.

into "misery," "torments," "punishments,"—nay, into the very fire prepared for the devil and his angels, "its eternity "only being removed."

The illustrious confessor St. Hilary, Bishop of Poictiers, is another witness against the doctrine of Purgatory. He remarks on the history of the rich man and Lazarus, "There is here no "putting off or delay; for the day of judgment is the eternal "retribution of blessedness or of punishment, but the time of "death, in the meanwhile, imposeth laws on all, for (the bosom "of) *Abraham, or punishment*, reserves every one to the judg-"ment."[y] That is, the righteous are in Abraham's bosom, and the sinners are in punishment.

A discourse, attributed by some to Theophilus of Alexandria, by others to Simeon Stylites,[z] in speaking of the just and the unjust when they die, says of the former, that his "soul goes "forth in joy and exultation with the saints . . . and is brought "into *a place of rest*, into *ineffable joy, and perpetual light, "where there is no grief, no groaning, nor weeping, no anxiety*, "but *immortal life, and everlasting joy*."[a] Of the unjust soul he says that "it is seized by devils at the day of death, and led "into an obscure, dark, and dismal place, where all the wicked "are reserved *until the day of judgment and eternal condem-"nation*."[b] He is thus evidently speaking of the intermediate state, and he considers the souls of the righteous to be at once in the enjoyment of happiness unmingled with any pain or evil.

Such too is the language of St. Basil. The moment of death is, according to him, the beginning of the believer's happiness: it leads not to torments, but to bliss. "If the dissolution of "this life," he says, "by which the soul is delivered from the "bondage of the flesh, is *the commencement of true life* to those

y Nihil illic dilationis aut moræ est. Judicii enim dies vel beatitudinis retributio est æterna, vel pœnæ. Tempus verò mortis habet interim unumquemque suis legibus, dum ad judicium unumquemque aut Abraham reservat, aut pœna. Hilar. Pictav. in Ps. ii. Oper. p. 52 ed. Bened.

z Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs Eccl. tom. xv. p 439.

a Si anima virtutes hic egregias sibi asciverit, vitamque severam et honestam traduxerit; in die sui exitus, illæ ipsæ quas hic sibi comparavit virtutes eam comitantur, stipantque boni angeli, nec ab illo adversario eorum dæmone eam sinunt contingi. Verum in gaudio et exultatione cum sanctis proficiscitur, et angelis victoriæ hymnos concinentibus Deo . . . in quietis locum perducitur, in gaudium ineffabile, in lumen perpetuum; ubi non est mœror, nec gemitus, neque fletus, neque anxietas, sed vita immortalis et perennis lætita. Bibl. Patr. Ludg. 1677, tom vii. p. 1228.

b Eam occupant dæmones miseris modis lachrymantem . . . in loca obscura, tenebrosa, et tristia deducentes; ubi cuncti nocentes, ad diem judicii ac æternæ damnationis asservantur. Ibid.

"who live according to God, why are we grieved, as if we had "no hope?"[c] St. Gregory Nazianzen, the friend of Basil, still more distinctly confirms the truth in the following passage; "I "am persuaded by the words of the wise, that every soul "which is good and beloved of God, when loosened from the "bonds of the flesh, it departs hence, *immediately feels and con-templates the good which awaits it*, being purified and deliv-"vered (I know not how to say it) from what had darkened it; "and *enjoys a certain wondrous pleasure, and rejoiceth, and "joyfully goeth to its Lord*, escaping from this life as from a "grievous prison, and shaking off the trammels which had "bound its wings of thought; and enjoys (as it does now in "fancy) the happiness laid up for it. But after a little it receives "again its native flesh . . . and with it enjoys heavenly glory."[d] Such, according to this illustrious Father, is the state of the departed faithful. They are in the immediate enjoyment of happiness with God, in the contemplation of the glory into which they shall shortly enter.

Hence, when the Fathers speak of the departed righteous, they never think of representing them as "struggling in tor-"tures," or as suffering "punishments." Their words are full of rejoicing, of triumph, and of consolation. Thus Gregory Nazianzen says of his sister Gorgonia, "I well know that you "*now* enjoy things more excellent than all that we can behold "—the sound of feastings, the exultations of angels, the con-"templation of glory, and a purer and more perfect illumina-"tion of the supreme Trinity."[e] He speaks elsewhere of his Father Gregory, Bishop of Nazianzum, as being "*near to "God*," and as having "become possessed of the angelical "order and boldness."[f]

You have quoted, in support of the doctrine of Purgatory, some writings of St. Gregory Nyssene, which had been inter-polated and corrupted by the Origenist heretics. His genuine belief was widely different from that which you have attributed to him. He believed that the souls of the righteous are, imme-diately after death, in a state of joy and glory. Thus in his Funeral Oration on Pulcheria, he consoles her mother, the Em-press Placilla, in the following terms; "Therefore, although "thy child hath left thee, she hath departed to the Lord. She "hath closed her eyes to thee, but *opened them on eternal light*.

[c] Basil. Epist. ci. Oper. tom. iii. p. 197. ed. Bened.
[d] Gregorius Nazianzenus, Orat. vii. al. x. tom. i. p. 212, 213. Oper ed. Bened.
[e] Orat. viii. al. xi. tom. i. p. 232.
[f] Orat. xviii. al. xix. tom. i. p. 332.

"She hath departed from thy table, but *hath been received at "that of the angels.* The plant hath been removed from this, "but *hath been planted in Paradise:* it hath changed *from one "kingdom to another.*"[g] In his Funeral Oration on the Empress Placilla, herself, he says: "The good we seek, brethren, "still exists: it is not lost. I speak less than the truth. "That good not only exists, but is *more exalted* than before. "Do you seek the Empress? *She hath her dwelling in regal "mansions.* But do you desire to see her? You cannot behold "her countenance. There is a dreadful guard of angels "around her."[h]

I have already (p. 26.) quoted the language of St. Ambrose in reference to the Emperor Theodosius. Similar expressions might be produced in abundance from his works, in proof of his belief that the souls of the departed righteous are in peace and joy. I shall merely cite a few of his words in speaking of the death of Acholius Bishop of Thessalonica. "I know that he "*now rests in heavenly places* . . . He *now enjoys the perpetu-"al reward of his labours,* and the bonds of the flesh being dis-"solved, *is with Christ amongst the ministering angels* . . . He "is now *an inhabitant of the regions above, a possessor of the "eternal city, of the Jerusalem which is in Heaven.*"[i] Nor is it to be supposed that St. Ambrose imagined these blessings to be reserved for the exclusive enjoyment of those who were of an eminent and surpassing sanctity. He believed them to be shared alike by all the righteous after death; for in allusion to death, as being a dissolution of soul and body, he says, "What is the meaning of that dissolution, but that the body is "dissolved and remains at rest, and the soul turns to its rest and "is free, *which, if it be pious, is with Christ.*"[k] He elsewhere says, "Death is the passing of all things. It is a passing from "corruption to incorruption . . . from *perturbation to tranquil-"lity.*"[l] He therefore encourages us to depart from this life without apprehension. "Let us go without fear to our Redeem-"er, Jesus Christ . . . to that assembly of the holy and just. "For we shall go to our fathers, to those preceptors of our faith "... where Abraham opens his holy bosom, where there is *a "paradise of delight; where there is no cloud, no thunderings,*"[m]

[g] Gregorius Nyssen. In Funere Pulcheriæ Oratio, tom. iii. Oper. p. 517.
[h] Orat. in Funere Placilliæ, tom. iii. p. 529.
[i] Ambros. Epist. xvi. t. ii. p. 819.
[k] Ambros. De Bono Mortis, cap. iii. tom. i. p 392.
[l] Ibid. cap. iv. p. 396.
[m] Ibid. cap. xii. p. 411.

&c. It is clear, therefore, that St. Ambrose believed, that all the just are received into happiness immediately after death.

That Prudentius was of the same opinion, appears from his placing the righteous in Abraham's bosom, in a region of rest and enjoyment.

> Sed dum resolubile corpus
> Revocas, Deus, atque reformas,
> Quanam regione jubebis
> Animam *requiescere* puram?
> Gremio sensis abdita sancti
> Recubabit, ut est Eleazar, (Lazarus)
> Quem floribus undique septum
> Dives procul aspicit ardens.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Patet ecce fidelibus ampli
> Via lucida jam *paradisi;*
> *Licet et nemus illud adire*
> *Homini, quod ademerat anguis.*[n]

St. John Chrysostom, in innumerable places, confirms the Catholic doctrine which we maintain. On those words, "Turn "again then to thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord hath reward-"ed thee," he remarks: "You see then, that death is *a benefit*, "*and a rest*, for he who hath entered into that rest, *hath rested* "*from his works*, as God rested from his own."[o] "Lamenta-"tion becomes the wickedness of him [who dies at enmity with "God], but not thee who art about *to be crowned, and to be at* "*rest.*"[p] When consoling a friend for the loss of one whom he had loved, he says: "Think, *to whom he hath departed;* and "receive consolation. *He is where Paul, where Peter, where* "*all the choir of saints are.*"[q] He tells a parent deprived of his child to think, that "he hath departed *to a better place,* "and hath *gone to a more excellent seat;* and that he has not "lost his son, but placed him in security."[r] "The righteous," he says, "whether they be *here* (on earth) or *there,* are *with* "*the King*, and there much more, and more nearly."[s] In speaking of funeral rites, he enquires: "Do we not glorify "God, and *give thanks,* because *he hath already crowned the* "*departed;* because he hath delivered him from his labours; "because, expelling fear, he *hath him with himself?* Are not

[n] Prudentius, Hymn. de Exequiis, Oper. tom. i. p. 362, 363. ed. Arevalo.

[o] Chrysost. Homil. de Bern. et Prosd. tom. ii. p. 639. Ed. Ben.

[p] Homil. xxxi al. xxxii. in Matt. tom. vii. p. 361.

[q] Homil. in illud 'De dormientibus,' tom. i. p. 766.

[r] Hom. i. in 2 Cor. tom x. p. 426.

[s] Hom. iii. in Phil. tom. xi. p. 216.

"hymns and psalms sung on this account? All these things "are signs of *rejoicing*."[t]

Isidore of Pelusium, a disciple of Chrysostom, incidentally teaches the same doctrine, where he speaks of a certain person, "having heard that that wise man" (Ammonius Bishop of Pelusium) "had fallen asleep, *and been received into heavenly* "*places*."[u] In another place, writing to Theophilus on the death of a Christian named Timotheus, he says, "The blessed "Timotheus, thy brother, hath departed from men . . . *ascend*-"*ing to heaven* in his soul; and as I believe, *mingling with the* "*exultations of the divine and heavenly powers*."[x] St. Jerome, in his epitaph on Nepotianus, says that "he is *with Christ, and* "*joined with the choir of the saints*."[y] Of Lea who had lately died, he says: "For her short labour, *she now enjoys eternal* "*felicity*; she is *received by the choirs of angels*, and "*cherished in Abraham's bosom*."[z] In his epitaph on Paula he says, that "she *now enjoys* these good things, 'which eye hath "not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath entered into the heart of "man.'"[a] It is quite impossible that if St. Jerome had held the doctrine of Purgatory, he could have thus described the condition of the departed righteous.

Although St. Augustine, in some parts of his works speaks, with *doubt and hesitation*, of a fire which shall save some of those who depart this life in sins which are not of a very grievous nature, he, nevertheless, constantly teaches, that the *just or righteous* are received into joy after the present life. We have already seen some proofs of this (p. 27, 28). He elsewhere maintains, that "if, after the human generation in "Adam, a soul be regenerated in Christ, and belongeth to "his society, it will have *rest* after the death of the body, and "will receive again the body unto glory. These things con-"cerning the soul, I most firmly hold."[b] "All souls," he says, "have, when they depart from this life, their different recep-"tions. THE GOOD HAVE JOY; the evil, torments. But when "the resurrection shall have taken place, THE JOY OF THE "GOOD WILL BE GREATER, and the torments of the wicked "more grievous, because they will be tortured with the body.

t Hom. iv. in Hebr. tom. xii. p. 46.
u Isidorus Pelus. Epist. lib. ii. Ep. 127. p. 179. ed. Paris, 1638.
x Epist. cli. p. 197.
y Hieron. Epist. xxxv. ad Heliodorum (al. iii.) tom. iv. pars ii. p. 269. ed. Bened.
z Epist. xx. ad Marcellam (al. 24.) Ibid. p. 52.
a Epist. lxxxv. ad Eustoch. (al. 27.) Ibid. p. 688.
b Augustinus, De Origine animæ hominis, Epist. clxvi. (al. 28.) tom. ii. Oper. p. 585.

"*The holy Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles Martyrs,* AND THE "GOOD AND FAITHFUL, HAVE BEEN RECEIVED IN PEACE; *yet all* "are yet to receive, at the end, what God hath promised .... "The *rest which is given immediately after death,* is then "received by every one who deserves it, when he dies. The 'Patriarchs received it first: behold how long is their rest: "afterwards the Prophets received it: more recently the Apos-'tles; still more lately the holy Martyrs: and now every day, "*good believers.*"[c] According to St. Augustine, therefore, the departed righteous are with the Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs, and consequently are in a state of joy, and suffer no torment or evil whatever.

I must pass over various other proofs from this eminent Father, and proceed to adduce the clear and satisfactory language of St. Cyril of Alexandria. "The Evangelist probably "said designedly and necessarily, not simply that he (our "Lord) 'died,' but that he 'commended his spirit,' i. e. to the "Father, according to what was said by him: 'Father, into "thy hands I commend my spirit;' and the force of this lan-"guage laid the commencement and foundation of a good hope "for us. For I think it should be held, and very reasonably "too, that the souls of the holy, when they are departing from "their earthly bodies, are 'commended into the hands' of a "most dear Father, through the goodness and mercy of God; "and are not, as some of the unbelieving have thought, waiting "amidst the tombs, expecting sepulchral rites; nor like the "souls of sinners, are thrust into a place of immense *punish-*"*ment,* that is, into Hell; but rather hasten away into the "hands of the Father of all, and of Jesus Christ our Saviour, "who hath restored this way to us. For he delivered his soul "into his Father's hands, that we also might have glorious 'hopes, firmly thinking and believing that *when we have suffered* "*bodily death, we shall be in the hands of God,* and *in a far* "*better state than when we were in the flesh.* Wherefore the "wise Paul writeth to us. 'I wish to be dissolved, and to be

[c] Habent ergò omnes animæ . . . cùm de sæculo exierint diversas receptiones suas: habent gaudium bonæ, malæ tormenta. Sed cùm facta fuerit resurrectio, et bonorum gaudium amplius erit, et malorum tormenta graviora: quando cum corpore torquebuntur. Recepti sunt in pace sancti Patriarchæ, Prophetæ, Apostoli, Martyres, boni fideles, omnes tamen adhuc in fine accepturi sunt quod promisit Deus . . . Requiem quæ continuò post mortem datur, si eâ dignus est, tunc accipit quisque cum moritur. Priores acceperunt Patriarchæ: videte ex quo requiescunt: posteriores Prophetæ; recentiùs Apostoli, multò recentiores sancti Martyres, quotidie boni fideles. August. Tract. xlix. in Joan. tom. iii. pars ii. p. 623. ed. Bened.

" with Christ.'"[d] "Formerly, indeed, human souls, having " put off their bodies, were cast into subterranean prisons, and " filled the receptacles of death therein; but after that Christ " commended his spirit to his Father, he hath changed this " way for us. For now we do not descend to Hell, but rather " shall follow him; and committing our souls to him as a " faithful Creator, *we shall live for a while in good hope*, for " Christ shall at length raise us all."[e]

Julian Pomerius, a learned presbyter of the fifth century,[f] remarks, that our "contest is at an end when, after this life, " certain victory succeeds to contest; that all the soldiers of " Christ who through God's assistance, have indefatigably re- " sisted their enemies to the end of this present life, *may reign* " *in joy in their own country*, after their laborious pilgrimage is " at an end."[g] The author of the works attributed to St. Dionysius the Areopagite, which were much approved in the Church, and were composed about the fifth century, says, that the " pious coming to the end of his contests in this life, is filled with " holy rejoicing, and with exceeding happiness enters on the " pathway of his resurrection."[h] He adds, that the just go to Abraham's bosom, which he thinks "is the divine and happy " lot of the blessed Patriarchs, and of all other saints, which " receives all those who resemble God into perpetual and most " happy perfection therein."[i] A work attributed to Justin Martyr, but which seems to have been written also in the fifth century, furnishes another evidence of the prevalence of sound doctrine. "After the departure of souls from the body, " the just are immediately separated from the unjust; for they " are brought by the angels to their fitting places. And *the* " *souls of the just are brought to Paradise, where they enjoy the* " *converse and view of the angels and archangels*, and even that " of our Saviour Christ himself, by vision, according to that " which was said, 'We are absent from the body and present " with the Lord.'"[k]

Aretas, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, in the Sixth Century, says, that "the souls which *are at rest in the bosom of Abraham*, are deservedly happy in the hope of those (heavenly)

[d] Cyril. Alexandrinus, Comment. in Joan. lib. xii. p. 1069. tom. iv. Oper. ed. Auburt.

[e] De Recta Fide, tom. v. Oper. pars ii. p. 176.

[f] See Ceillier, tom. xv. p. 451.

[g] Julian. Pomerius De Vita Comtemplativa, lib. i. cap. i. (attributed to Prosper of Aquitaine.)

[h] Dionys. Arcop. Eccl. Hier. cap. vii. p, 141. Oper. ed. 1615.

[i] Ibid. p. 147.

[k] Quæst. et Resp. ad Orthodox. Qu. lxxv.

things which are contemplated by the intellect as in a glass; for it has been said by many of the saints, that *every good man is allotted a fitting place*, whence also he may form a certain conjecture of his future glory.[l]

St. Eligius, Bishop of Noyon in the seventh century, taught the same doctrine; "that when the soul is severed from the "body, it is *immediately*, according to its merits, *placed in* "*Paradise;* or certainly, for its sins, is precipitated into Hell."[m] St. Theophylact affirms, that "*the souls of the just are in the* "*hand of God;* but those of the wicked are carried hence like "that of the rich man."[n]

In addition to these evidences of the Church's belief in reference to the blessedness of the departed faithful, it would be easy to produce abundant authorities in opposition to the notions on which the doctrine of Purgatory is based—to shew that it was not believed that any penalties, whether temporal or eternal, await the righteous after this life; or that any sins can be remitted after death.

The illustrious Confessor, St. Fulgentius, Bishop of Ruspa, in commenting on Matt. xxi. 32. 36, "It shall not be forgiven "him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come," entirely subverts the foundation on which the doctrine of Purgatory is built. "By these words," he says, "our Lord and Saviour "*did not intimate that any sins will be forgiven in the world to* "*come, which have not been forgiven in this world*, but shews "to those who rightly understand, that no other sins will be "forgiven in the future world, but those only which, *in this* "*world*, have been forgiven in the true Catholic Church. For "to her alone did the Lord give the power of binding and loos-"ing, saying, 'I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of "Heaven,' &c. Whatever, therefore, the holy Church hath not "loosed in this world, shall remain so indissoluble, that it can-"not by any means be loosed in the future world.[o]"

St. Gregory Nazianzen directly and formally denies that there is any Purgatory in the next life. After speaking of the scourges by which God purifies men in this life, he adds: "It "is better to be chastised and *purged* now, (in life) than to be "delivered to that torture (after death); since then shall be

[l] Aretas, Comment. in cap. vi. Apocalyps.

[m] Eligius, De rectitud. Catholic. Conversationis, inter Augustini Opera, tom. vi. Append. col. 274.

[n] Theophylact. Comment. in Matt. viii.

[o] Hoc verbo Dominus et salvator noster non aliqua peccata insinuavit futuro sæculo dimittenda, quæ in hoc sæculo dimissa non fuerint, &c. Fulgentius, De Remissione Peccatorum, lib. i. cap. 24.

'the time of punishment, NOT OF EXPURGATION."[p] St. John Chrysostom says that "*the fire shall not hurt* the soul which is "pure."[q]

In fine the Fathers condemn the doctrine that any punishments are due to remitted sins. "When the guilt is removed," says Tertullian, "the punishment is so likewise."[r] "Where "there is grace there is remission," says Chrysostom; "where "there is remission, there is *no punishment*."[s] Augustine enquires, "Why is it said, 'thy sins are covered?' It is, that "*they may not be seen*. For why was God to see sins, unless "to punish them."[t]

"*What*," says Fulgentius, "do we suppose cannot be re"mitted to us, when the Lord 'pardons all our iniquities?' "What do we imagine cannot be healed in us, when the Lord "'healeth all our infirmities?' Or how can he who is healed "and *justified* be in want of any thing, when he is 'satisfied "with good things?' Or how can it be supposed that he does not "enjoy the benefit of *complete remission*, who is 'crowned with "mercy and loving-kindness?'"[u]

St. Bernard says: "He so wholly pardoned, and so liberally "forgave every injury, that he now does not condemn *by re*"*venging*, nor confounds by upbraiding, nor loves less by im"puting. Some there are who forgive injury so as not to "revenge it, but still they upbraid. Others there are who are "silent, though somewhat remains deeply rooted in their "minds, and they retain inward rancour. In neither case is "there a full pardon. Far from these is the benignant nature "of the Godhead. HE ACTS WITH LIBERALITY: HE FORGIVES "ENTIRELY."[x]

Surely such a doctrine is calculated to inspire hope, and consolation, and gratitude to God. We hold that when God forgives the justified sinner, he forgives ENTIRELY. He reserves no torments. He entertains no "wrath." He seeks for no "revenging tortures." He receives the trembling and unprofitable outcast into his bosom, and clothes him with garments of

p Orat. xvi. tom. i. p. 304, 305.

q Hom. viii. De Pœnitentia, tom. ii. p. 320.

r Exempto scilicet reatu, eximitur et pœna. Tertul. De Baptismo, cap. v. p. 226. ed. Rigaltii.

s Ὅπου γὰρ χάρις, συγχώρησις. ὅπου δὲ συγχώρησις, οὐδεμία κόλασις. Hom. viii. in Epist. ad Rom, tom. ix. p. 502.

t Tecta ergo peccata quare dixit? Ut non viderentur. Quid enim erat Dei videre peccata, nisi punire peccata? August. Enarrat. ii. in Ps. xxxi. tom. iv.

u Fulgentius, Epist. xii. ad Venantiam, De Pœnitentia. Bibl. Patr.

x Bernard. Serm. De Fragmentis, col. 300 Oper. ed. Paris. 1586

joy. He may require works of repentance, and may impose afflictions before he justifies the sinner; but justification and sanctification infer the cessation of all *wrath*, and a full satisfaction of *Divine justice*. The just have therefore nothing to fear from God's justice, while they continue in a state of justification. They have nothing to dread from it in this world or beyond the grave.

The holy Scriptures, and the united voice of Catholic tradition, confirm this doctrine. They proclaim rest, and peace, and joy to the departed faithful, even from the moment in which the soul departs from the body. The opinions of one or two individual writers in the fifth or sixth centuries, cannot have any weight against such authority.

I shall only add in conclusion, that the Catholic Church has never defined the doctrine of Purgatory, or by any formal act expressed her belief in it; for the Council of Florence was not Œcumenical, having been held when the rival, and more numerous Council of Basle was sitting; and accordingly its authority is doubtful even amongst Romanists; besides which, it has always been rejected by the Eastern Church. And as for the Council of Trent, it was not only rejected by a great portion of the West, and by the whole Eastern Churches; but it does not even represent *the judgment of the Roman Churches;* inasmuch as its decrees were received on a blind principle of obedience, without examination or discussion. This I have endeavoured to shew in my Treatise on the Church, (vol. ii. p. 237, &c.) I therefore deny that its decrees are binding on Romanists; and I now invite you to prove, if you can, that the Roman Clergy are bound to receive its decisions as *de fide*, except by the *discipline* of their Church, which imposes on its Clergy the Profession of Faith of Pope Pius IV.

I remain, Sir, yours, &c.

WILLIAM PALMER.

Oxford, Nov. 26, 1841.

A

SEVENTH LETTER

TO

N. WISEMAN, D. D.

ON THE

DOCTRINE OF INDULGENCES.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M. A.

OF WORCESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

BALTIMORE:

JOSEPH ROBINSON,

110 BALTIMORE STREET.

1843.

A SEVENTH LETTER, &c.

§ 1. *Practical influence of Indulgences amongst Romanists.*

SIR,

COMPARATIVELY few of those who receive or dispute the doctrine of Indulgences, are aware of the profound influence which it exercises in the Communion of the Church of Rome. I have already stated that works of piety and charity are made to depend very much on Indulgences;[a] but this subject is of so much importance, and is so closely connected with a vast mass of abuses and superstitions of various kinds, that it merits a more extended examination.

An Indulgence, according to Romanists, is a remission of the penalties due to remitted sin either in this life or in Purgatory; and it is obtained by performing certain conditions prescribed by the authority which grants the Indulgence. Thus much may suffice at present, in order to enable us to comprehend the working of the system, which shall be considered under various heads.

I. PRIVILEGED ALTARS. The following description is given by the learned Thiers of the origin and uses of annexing Indulgences to attendance at particular Altars—a practice which he considers more recent than the Council of Trent. "The first notion apparently came from some mendicant Monk, who judging that this devotion could not be indifferent to his convent, solicited its establishment, or caused it to be solicited, at Rome . . . . He there procured a Brief for a privileged altar, for which he obtained the approbation of his Ordinary, who was perhaps an accommodating and obliging person. He then had it printed, posted up, and published everywhere; caused tablets to be made, with the inscription PRIVILEGED ALTAR in large letters; set them above the altar designed for Indulgences; on the doors of his church; and over the principal gate of his convent; caused the bells to ring and chime in an extraordinary manner; sent billets to every house; confessors invited devotees to the ceremony; the office was solemnly performed,

[a] Letter i. p. 23, &c.

the church magnificently adorned, and the *privileged altar* above all; the Indulgences were proclaimed; the people came in crowds to gain them, confessed, communicated, *and asked for masses at the privileged altar;* the monks who had previously been poor, had something to spare; the community was augmented to dispose of this; in a word, they derived advantage from this new invention.

"Nothing more was requisite to excite the holy jealousy of other mendicants . . . . They wrote, sent, solicited at the Court of Rome, and at length obtained them . . . . From the churches of the mendicants they passed to those of the other regulars; thence to some of the estated Monks, to parishes, to Collegiate and even Cathedral churches. It was perceived that they brought masses to the mendicants, and that the *payments for these masses* were a great assistance in supporting communities. Other regulars judged that this was a method not to be neglected: they, like the mendicants, set up titles of *privileged altars;* some even went beyond these titles, and added, HERE A SOUL IS DELIVERED FROM PURGATORY AT EVERY MASS, and others, while mass was said at their privileged altars (especially from the Consecration to the end of the Communion) let off *little fire-works* in the rear, in order to mark that at this moment a soul went out of Purgatory straight into Heaven! This I have seen practised in a celebrated church, and all Paris might have seen it as well as me.

"As there are always some Monks in monasteries, some Priests in parishes, some Canons or Chaplains in Collegiate and Cathedral churches, who have a little more skill than others to insinuate themselves into the minds of worthy people, who also know the rubrics and ceremonies, how to dress altars, to make bouquets of flowers, to clean and fold the ornaments, and to ring the bells better than others, they are usually charged with the Sacristy, the Register, and the *Mass-account;* and in order to deserve well of their communities . . . . one of their first cares is, to have a chapel dedicated to some new Saint; a new relic; or some extraordinary Image; but particularly *a privileged altar, in order to make masses come to the Sacristy,* under pretext of gaining Indulgences and delivering souls from Purgatory. The more sensible and enlightened communities, parishes and chapters pretend not to perceive these spiritual artifices, and when they are spoken to with a view to stop their course, or at least to banish the abuses and superstitions which are but too frequently met in them, they reply with an indifferent tone and in a negligent manner, 'That they have nothing to do with such matters; that it is Father this, or Mr. that, who has the care

of it; that they let him alone, do not wish to annoy him—that he intends well, and that his only object is to engage good persons in practices of piety.'

"They have however, no objection that their Sacristies should profit by the emoluments which arise from this, and to see themselves thus relieved from the expense of providing for the ornaments, lights, and repairs of their churches. This is the utility of privileged Altars."[b]

Such is one specimen of the practical working of the system of Indulgences. It brings large pecuniary profits to particular Churches; and it therefore becomes a matter of great importance to the clergy, to obtain the annexation of Indulgences to the highest possible amount to attendance in their churches. Accordingly there seems to be a continual struggle to outbid each other in the number and variety of Indulgences.

II. Privileged Churches. The same object is also attained by procuring the annexation of Indulgences to attendance at particular churches. Rodriguez, according to Thiers, states that there are so many Indulgences at the Church of St. John Lateran at Rome, that "God alone could count them." It appears from this writer and from the Jesuit Santarel, that the churches at Rome have generally extensive Indulgences annexed to them; and Thiers adds, that the greater part of the religious orders, and regular congregations, as well as many confraternities, enjoy all these Indulgences:[c] Thiers mentions many instances of such Indulgences annexed to particular churches elsewhere, which are, of course, as beneficial as privileged altars to the pecuniary interests of the Clergy.

III. Confraternities and Associations. The Roman Church authorizes an infinite multitude of voluntary associations of individuals for various purposes, connected more or less with religious or Ecclesiastical objects, and rewards their members by the grants of Indulgences. This system is entirely unknown in the English and the Oriental Churches, as it was also in the primitive ages. Its efficiency however is so unquestionable, that no association for any religious purpose, however good, is ever formed amongst Romanists, which does not speedily seek for Indulgences as necessary to its success.

Thus for example, in 1822 an Association was formed at Lyons "for the propagation of the Faith," with a view to aid Missionaries in foreign countries by their prayers and pecuniary subscriptions. One would have thought that these objects

[b] J. B. Thiers, Traité des Superstitions, Liv. vii. ch. xviii.
[c] J. B. Thiers, Liv. vii. ch. xiii.

would alone have been sufficient to engage the co-operation of all pious and sincere members of that Communion; and that all that was necessary was to recommend it to general attention on motives of Christian charity and of contributing to the glory of God. This was not sufficient: it would have been inoperative without the aid of the system we are now considering. "Pius VII," says Bouvier, "regarded this institution as salutary, *and in order to encourage it*, he granted to it, in 1823, the following *Indulgences, &c.*"[d]

Thus again, the Confraternity of the Holy Sacrament, established for the purpose of paying respect to the holy Eucharist, and of providing the necessary ornaments, and supplying lamps to burn in the churches, of attending the Sacrament in procession through the streets, assisting at certain ceremonies with torches, and performing various acts in honour of the Eucharist, was not only approved by Paul III. in 1539, but *Indulgences* were annexed to all the particular actions which its members were to perform.[e]

Again, if it be thought desirable to institute catechizing under any improved system, like that invented by Ollier curé of St. Sulpice in the seventeenth century, *Indulgences* are obtained for all who attend such instructions, and receive Confirmation and Communion.[f]

Confraternities are also established for aiding poor persons during pilgrimages, for honouring the name of God, and of Jesus Christ, for supporting hospitals, for giving marriage portions to poor young women, for aiding the poor and infirm, for visiting poor lunatics, for offering certain prayers every month and providing for the burial of poor persons, for instructing the ignorant in church every Sunday, for ransoming captives, &c.[g] All these associations are indebted to Indulgences for no small portion of their success. There is scarcely a charitable institution, or a good work of any kind to which they are not annexed.

IV. Devotions. This is closely connected with the preceding branch of our subject, for multitudes of Confraternities are established especially with a view to promote the practice of certain devotions or religious exercises. Thus the Confraternity of the Rosary is established for the purpose of repeating the Rosary in honour of the blessed Virgin, visiting the altars dedicated to its honour, especially on the festivals of the Virgin, hearing hymns in her honour, causing others to recite the Rosary, &c. It has been continually enriched with new Indulgences by the various Popes.[h]

[d] Bouvier, Traité des Indulgences, p. 361, 362.
[e] Bouvier, p. 317, 318. [f] Ibid. p. 363, 364. [g] Ibid. p. 325, &c.
[h] Ibid, p. 292, &c.

The Confraternity of the Scapular which is instituted in honour of the Virgin, and the members of which carry on their persons a piece of blessed cloth (called Scapular), to the possession of which various spiritual privileges are annexed, have also innumerable Indulgences for receiving this cloth; pronouncing the name of Jesus; assisting at religious processions; visiting devoutly the chapels of the Confraternity; reciting the little office of the Virgin, with acts of contrition; repeating Litanies containing invocations of Saints; repeating the Lord's Prayer and Ave Maria seven times a day in honour of the Virgin, &c. &c.[i]

In like manner the Confraternities for the perpetual adoration of the Sacrament;[k] for the honour of the holy Virgin of Help;[l] for worshipping the heart of Jesus and of Mary; for offering the prayers of the "holy hour" every Thursday;[m] for promoting certain religious exercises in colleges under the direction of the Jesuits;[n] and for worshipping and invoking particular Saints, such as St. John Baptist, St. Joseph, the Twelve Apostles, St. Benedict, St. Roch, the Holy Angels, &c. &c.,[o] are all supported by Indulgences.

But besides this, if it be thought desirable to promote and encourage any new prayer or act of worship of God or of the Saints, the mode adopted is to annex Indulgences to the practice. All the superstitious worship of the Saints is upheld by this means, as well as many other rites which are more or less tolerable or exceptionable. Such as, acts of worship to the *hearts* of Jesus and Mary;[p] the repetition of prayers to the Virgin when the bell sounds;[q] the repetition of the Gloria Patri, of the Ave Maria,[r] of ejaculations to the Eucharist; visiting the Eucharist; kneeling at the elevation of the Host; walking in procession after the same; repetition of hymns in honour of the Eucharist; invoking the names of Jesus and Mary and Joseph; praying before a crucifix; repeating Paters and Aves, for the dead; Litanies and prayers to the Virgin and Saints and Angels; the dedication of the month of May to the Virgin, &c. &c.[s] Ecclesiastics are rewarded with Indulgences for saying prayers;[t] Monks and Nuns for taking the vows, and entering on Retreats;[u] the Laity for discharging their religious duties. The whole frame of religion depends to a great extent on Indulgences.

i Bouvier, p. 301, &c.
k Ibid. p. 323.
l Ibid. p. 325.
m Ibid. p. 339.
n Ibid. p. 349.
o Ibid. p. 368.
p Ibid. p. 203.
q Ibid. p. 209.
r Ibid. p. 215.
s Ibid. p. 215—261.
t Ibid. p. 263.
u Ibid. p. 266.

In addition to this, there are innumerable Indulgences attached to the use of Rosaries, beads, medals, &c. with the repetition of a prescribed number of Paters and Aves in honour of our Lord, "of His five wounds," of His "blood," of the "Sacred heart." There are ordinary chaplets of the Virgin; blessed Crosses and medals; Brigittine chaplets; Indulgenced chaplets Brigittized, &c.; to all of which Indulgences are annexed,[x] and the use of which depends mainly on the doctrine under consideration.

V. Good Works. Not only acts of religious devotion to the Saints and to God are approved by the grants of Indulgences, but also various works, of charity, piety, or utility; such as resignation to the will of God,[y] prayer for the dying, teaching Christian doctrine, mental prayer,[z] visiting prisoners, almsgiving, &c. Amongst such works, to which Indulgences have been applied, may be further mentioned, crusades against infidels and heretics, or the payment of sums of money in aid of such objects. From this source the Pontiffs derived large profits during the middle ages.[a] The erection of churches and convents or contributions for their erection, is another subject of Indulgences;[b] and without doubt, many of the splendid churches erected under the Papal dominion, and especially St. Peter's itself, were built with the funds derived from Indulgences. The erection of *bridges* and other useful buildings is also considered a sufficient reason to induce the grant of Indulgences.

In fine, pilgrimages to Rome at the Jubilee for the purpose of visiting the principal churches are encouraged by the grant of Indulgences.[c] Up to the period of the Reformation the same privileges might be obtained by *pecuniary payments* in lieu of actual visitation of the city of Rome,[d] but from the time of the

[x] See these Indulgences in Bouvier, p. 160—200.

[y] Bouvier, p. 235.

[z] Ibid. p. 211.

[a] Ibid. p. 16. Fleury, Discours vi. sur l'Histoire Eccl. § 2, 6; Tournely, De Pœnit. tom. ii. p. 308. "Do I mean to say that during the middle ages and later, no abuse took place in the practice of Indulgences? Most certainly not. *Flagrant and too frequent* abuses doubtless occurred through the *avarice*, and *rapacity*, and *impiety*, of men; especially when Indulgence was granted to the contributors towards charitable or religious foundations." Wiseman, Controv. Lect. ii. 88. It apears from Amort, Theologia, tom. xv. p. 229, that the Indulgence of the Crusade is still in force in Spain, and is productive of pecuniary advantages.

[b] Bouvier, p. 27. Tournely, De Pœnit. tom. ii. p. 302. Bellarmin. de Indulg. lib. i. c. 12.

[c] Ibid, p. 370, &c.

[d] Ibid. p. 380.

Council of Trent those privileges have been extended to other Churches without payment.[e]

Thus much may suffice to shew how vast is the practical importance of the question now before us. I do not say that Indulgences form the *sole* motive to all religious acts in Romanism; but it is perfectly in vain to deny, with these facts before us, that they constitute a great and most important motive to such acts. If they do not, then why is it, that acts and practices in themselves most laudable, or most necessary, or most immediately resulting from the principles of Christian piety or charity, cannot subsist without Indulgences? Bouvier Bishop of Mans says that "the prospect of *Indulgences* engages the faithful *to frequent the Sacraments*, to be more *watchful* over themselves, to *correct their faults*, and to *live better*. It is this which the Roman Pontiffs *ordinarily* propose to themselves in the numerous grants of Indulgences which they are continually making, and especially in the solemnities of the jubilee."[f] So influential, indeed, are Indulgences on the practice of Romanists, that they have been and are still absolutely overrun with forged and spurious Indulgences. Their writers have found it necessary to expose the falsity of numbers of grants.[g] Their Chief Authorities have been obliged to suppress them in large masses.[h] Their bishops are obliged to be on their guard, and to watch narrowly lest spurious Indulgences should be put forward.[i] Everything, in short, proclaims the vast practical influence of the system of Indulgences.

In truth, if we consider what the doctrine of Romanists really is, we shall see immediately the reasons which must induce them most eagerly to desire Indulgences, and most zealously to practise all the works to which they are annexed. You hold, then, that after the guilt and eternal punishment of sin is removed by the Sacrament of Penance, temporal penalties still remain due to the Divine *justice* either in this world or in the next. You believe that the afflictions of life are part of this temporal penalty; that Christians are bound to spend their lives in painful voluntary penances in order to satisfy God; that after

[e] Ibid.

[f] See Bouvier, p. 27.

[g] Thiers spends two hundred and fifty pages of his work in shewing that multitudes of Indulgences generally received in the Roman Communion are spurious or null. Traite des Superstit. tom. iv. liv. vii.

[h] Bouvier, p. 38; Amort, De Indulgentiis, Disp. vii. p. 242. tom. xv. Theologiæ; Thiers, Traité des Superstitions, lib. vii. c. 2.

[i] Benedict. xiv. De Synodo Diœces. L. xiii. c. 18; Bouvier, p. 36, &c.

this life, punishments of the most horrible description are to complete the amount of suffering not discharged in this life; that the justified soul is perhaps for thousands of years still subject to the wrath and justice of God, and suffering tortures far exceeding any that can be endured in this life. With such opinions, Indulgences, which remit a portion or the whole of this temporal punishment, must of course become the objects of most intense desire; and as your writers contrive very ingeniously to render it doubtful, whether in any particular case, the Indulgence has been really and certainly attained,[k] the consequence is, that Romanists are bound by their own principles to continue during their whole lives, the labour to attain Indulgences, in the hope that some may at last be really placed to their account, and may thus diminish the tortures of Purgatory.

Another motive to the acquisition of Indulgences is, that they are, in general, made *applicable to the dead*;[l] so that the living may, by performing certain works, to which Indulgences are annexed, obtain relief for their departed friends and relatives, who are supposed to be enduring tortures in Purgatory. This is without doubt a most powerful motive, and combined with what has been already said, will sufficiently shew the extreme desire which Romanists must have to obtain Indulgences, and the strength of the motive which must influence them to perform works to which Indulgences are annexed.

§ 2. *The Romish doctrine of Indulgences refuted.*

We are now to consider the basis on which all this system depends—the doctrine of Indulgences and its proofs. I shall avail myself without scruple of your statement of that doctrine, because it is strictly in harmony with the general belief of Romanists.

An Indulgence then is: "A remission by the Church in virtue of the *keys*, or the judicial authority committed to her, of a portion, or the entire, of the *temporal punishment* due to sin. The infinite merits of Christ form the fund from whence this remission is derived: but besides, the Church holds that by the Communion of Saints, penitential works performed by the just, beyond what their sins might exact, are available to other members of Christ's mystical body."[m]

[k] See above, Letter iii. p. 7. 8.

[l] Bouvier, p. 70, &c.

[m] Wiseman, Controv. Lectures, ii. 71; Ligorio, Theologia Moralis, lib. vi. n. 531; Tournely, de Pœnit. tom. ii. p. 251; Bellarmin. de Indulgentiis, lib. i. c. 1; Bouvier, de Pœnitentia, p. 290;

I. It is plain that this doctrine depends entirely on the supposition, that temporal penalties remain due to the divine justice for remitted sin; for if no such penalties are to be endured, Indulgences with the object of averting them, must be wholly useless and absurd. Now it has been already shewn, that there is no proof that God exacts any penalties of the kind under the Christian dispensation;[n] and that so far from any debt still remaining due to His justice after sin has been remitted, and the sinner justified; the Roman Church herself holds, that a state of *justification* implies the closest union with God, and acceptance into His favour and love; and consequently the previous satisfaction of all claims of His justice;[o] for it would be impossible to imagine for a moment, that God could receive to His love, those against whom His justice had still heavy demands, and who were still subject to His wrath. The union of the justified with God, and the rich graces which they receive from Him, prove beyond all doubt that He is fully reconciled to them, and that his justice has no further demands. And this being the case, Indulgences (in the Romish sense) must be useless and pernicious impostures.

II. I cannot but remark on the almost incredible blindness of those who attempt to prove the Romish doctrine of Indulgences from Scripture, to the fact, that their own doctrine is entirely subversive of the attempt.

You yourself argue with many others,[p] that the power of granting Indulgences or *remissions of temporal penalties,* "is included in the commission given by Christ to His Apostles to forgive or retain sins."[q]

But you forget, that according to the doctrine of the Council of Trent, and of all your writers, temporal penalties remain due, after sin is remitted by virtue of the authority here conferred. You forget that you have yourself asserted, that "upon this *forgiveness of sins,*" authorized by the above passage, "that is, after the remission of that eternal debt, which God by his justice awards to transgressions against His law, He has been pleased to *reserve* a certain degree of inferior or *temporary punishment;*"[r] and you seem to forget that this very principle is the *basis* on which the necessity of Satisfactions or Penances,

Trevern, Discuss. Amic. tom. ii. p. 232; Faith of Catholics, p. 349; Milner, End of Controv. Lett. xlii.; Hornyhold, Real principles of Cath. p. 278; Walenburch. Controv. tom. ii. p. 20; Amort, Theol. Mor. tom. xv. p. 1.

[n] Letter ii. p. 15, &c.

[o] Wiseman, p. 39, Letter vi. p. 16, 17.

[p] Contr. Lect. ii. 72: Trevern, Discuss. Amicale, tom. ii. p. 227.

[q] John xx. 23.

[r] Contr. Lect. p. 41.

the belief in Purgatory, and even the doctrine of Indulgences itself, are built. But observe, that if this principle be true and sound, the Church cannot have the power of remitting temporal penalties, because they remain due *after* her power of remission conferred in Holy Scripture has been exercised; and consequently, Indulgences, in your sense, are impostures. On the other hand, if the power of remitting sin given in Holy Scripture *does* include the power of removing its temporal penalties, there are no temporal penalties due to *remitted* sin; and consequently Penances for *remitted* sins are worse than superfluous; and Indulgences, with the view of remitting such penalties, are equally fallacious and absurd.

The same observations are applicable to the other texts from which the power of the Church to grant Indulgences is deduced by Romish theologians: I mean the promise of our Lord to St. Peter, "I will give thee the keys, &c. And whatsoever thou shalt bind in earth," &c. which was afterwards extended to the Church.

It is argued from these passages,[s] that as the power here given is general and without exception, it must include the power of remitting the *temporal penalties* of sin, as well as its eternal penalties.

I have only to remark, that if it *does* include such a power, then it follows, that *Absolution remits the temporal penalties of sin;* that such penalties are therefore no longer due to *remitted* sin, and that there is no necessity for Satisfactions or Indulgences to avert those temporal penalties. If, on the other hand, no such power is given by these passages, Indulgences, which are acts of that power, are unauthorized and unlawful.

Your doctrine of Satisfaction then renders it impossible for you to maintain, that the above texts include any power to remit temporal penalties by Indulgences. But besides this, there is another proof that you do not yourselves believe these texts to include any such power, because you hold that *the Sacrament of Penance* was announced and instituted in them: you believe therefore that the powers comprised in them were conferred on *Priests*, and yet none of your Priests can grant *Indulgences*. Is it not plain therefore, either that these texts do not, in your opinion, confer the power of granting Indulgences; or else that you prevent Priests from discharging powers, which you believe them to possess *de jure divino?* The last alternative you will not of course receive: it therefore follows, that you do not believe the above texts to include the power of granting Indulgences.

[s] Bouvier, Traité des Indulg. p. 11; Trevern, *ubi supra*.

The only example of an Indulgence which you and other Romish divines pretend to discover in Holy Scripture, is in the case of the incestuous Corinthian, in which "the term of punishment is abridged and the sentence reversed, before the completion of the awarded retribution is arrived; and this was in consequence of the very great sorrow manifested by the penitent, which was considered an equivalent for the remaining portion;" and this is you say, "precisely what we *should call an Indulgence.*"[t]

This case is disposed of in a moment, by considering that an Indulgence is, according to Romanists, "a relaxation of temporal penalties due to *remitted* sin." But the penalties imposed in this case were not for *remitted* sin. When St. Paul commanded "such an one to be delivered to Satan," (1 Cor. v. 5.) he was still apparently in the commission of most grievous sin; and as such, St. Paul speaks of him (verse 13.) as "that *wicked* person." Consequently his punishment was not inflicted *after his sin had been remitted;* and therefore the remission of that punishment on his repentance was not an *Indulgence* in your sense of the term, but a remission of the penalty inflicted, accompanied by an act of forgiveness of sin, as the Apostle intimates (2 Cor. ii. 7. 10.) where he *forgives* the offender, in the name of Jesus Christ, and authorizes the Church at Corinth to do so likewise, as the offender had given signs of real penitence.

We next turn to the proofs for Indulgences from Christian Antiquity; and here again I shall take the liberty of noticing those which you have selected as the most conclusive.

Your proofs then are derived from the practice of the primitive Church in relaxing the penances imposed according to the Canons, on those who had confessed their sins and sought to be restored to the communion of the Church.

You allege, that "there are the strongest reasons to believe, that in most cases absolution *preceded the allotment of this penance*, or at least that it was granted *during the time of its performance*," *because* the custom of the Roman and other Churches was, to admit penitents yearly to Communion on Holy Thursday, "a circumstance incompatible with the idea of their receiving no pardon till the conclusion of their penance."[u]

The answer to this is, that the penitents reconciled on Holy Thursday in each year, were those who had *completed* their canonical penance.

[t] Wiseman, Controv. Lectures, ii. p. 75.
[u] Wiseman, Controv. Lectures, ii. p. 76.

You next assert rightly, that the Church reserved to herself the right of *mitigating* the canonical penances, on account of "extraordinary sorrow and fervour manifested by the penitent; or on account of "the approach of persecution, when the penitents would have an opportunity of testifying their sorrow by patient endurance, and where it was thought inexpedient to leave them unfortified by the Eucharist;" or in case the penitents were "in danger of death," in which case they were, on recovery, to conclude their time of penance; or sometimes "when intercession was made in favour of the repenting sinner by persons justly possessing influence with the Pastors of the Church;" or in fine, when penitents obtained letters of recommendation to mercy from the martyrs imprisoned for the name of Jesus Christ.[x] In all these cases the Church mitigated the penances which had been imposed on sinners, and restored them to Communion. Without doubt, innumerable proofs of all this may be brought from the Fathers and the Councils; but it can be of no avail to the advocates of Indulgences in the Romish sense of the term. For be it remembered, that according to Romanists, an Indulgence is the remission of temporal penalties due to *remitted sin*. The sin is therefore pardoned and absolved *before* the Indulgence can be obtained. But in all the instances ever cited from the primitive ages, *the Indulgence was a necessary preliminary to absolution: absolution was only granted in consequence of Indulgence;* and therefore these ancient Indulgences were *not remissions of temporal penalties due to absolved or remitted sin*. This is conclusive against your doctrine of Indulgences.

The truth is, that Indulgences were always in primitive times regarded simply as *relaxations of penances imposed for sins*, either by way of remission or by commuting them for some less penances. No one ever thought of regarding them as remissions of temporal penalties due to God's justice for remitted sins. Maldonatus has stated, that the Indulgences granted by the Roman Pontiffs themselves always profess to remit the "enjoined penance."[y] They do not themselves pretend to remit the temporal penalties due to God's justice for remitted sin; nor to relieve souls in Purgatory. These latter uses of Indulgences are merely the *inventions of Theologians*, which are not sanctioned either by the doctrines of antiquity, or by the form of Indulgences themselves.

[x] Wiseman, Controv. Lectures, ii. p. 77—81.

[y] Maldonatus, de Sacramentis, tom. ii. p. 18 It is said that this clause has been omitted in modern grants of Indulgences; doubtless because it too plainly shewed the real and ancient objects of those remissions.

But there is another essential difference between Romish Indulgences and those of primitive times. It is admitted by Romanists that Indulgences refer to the remission of *satisfactions* due for sin; but it has been proved in a former letter, that according to the doctrine of Scripture, Antiquity, and the Roman Church herself, *satisfactions* are not merely for the *temporal penalties* remaining due to sin, but for its *guilt* and *eternal penalties;*[z] consequently Indulgences do not refer merely to the remission of its temporal penalties, but to that of its guilt (*culpa*) and eternal penalties; and therefore if they follow the remission of sin, they are null and void.

The practice of the ancient Church having always been to grant Indulgences as a preliminary to Absolution, it remains to be considered how this discipline has come to be entirely reversed by the Roman Church, which now makes Absolution a preliminary to Indulgences.

Indulgences then *in the sense of remissions or commutations of Canonical Penances*, had been found in the time of the Crusades most effective instruments, in influencing the actions of Christians to such works as were thought highly beneficial to the Popes, and to the Church generally. But about the same time, notions were growing up amongst Latin theologians which led to a change of practice with regard to Absolution and Indulgences. "At the same time," says Fleury, "the practice was introduced of giving Absolution, even after secret penitence, *immediately after* confession and satisfaction imposed and accepted: whereas in antiquity it was not given unless at the end, or at least after a great part of the penance had been accomplished. This change was founded on the reasonings of the scholastic doctors, that external Absolution ought not to be refused to him who, (one should believe,) had already received it internally from God, in virtue of the contrition which he appeared to have in his heart." Tournely[a] speaks of this custom as introduced in the eleventh or twelfth century.[b]

The immediate effect of this on Indulgences was twofold. First, it made Absolution precede them, instead of being preceded by them as formerly. Secondly, as the guilt and eternal punishment were believed to be removed by contrition and Absolution, Satisfactions or Penances were believed only to be for

[z] Letter iv. p. 18—37.

[a] Fleury, Discours iv. sur l'Hist. Eccl. § 15.

[b] Tournely, Tractatus de Pœnitentia, tom. ii. p. 36. Tournely proves, p. 42, &c. that while public penitence was in use, Sacramental Absolution from sins was given after satisfaction had been completed.

temporal punishments; and Indulgences, being *remissions of those Satisfactions*, were considered to act only on temporal punishments likewise. And thus the present Romish practice and doctrine were introduced, in opposition to those of primitive times. These are not merely my statements: they are those of Morinus, one of your most learned and celebrated authors—whose authority on questions of this nature is indisputable. He actually fixes the date of your doctrine of Indulgences, as not more ancient than the *twelfth* century.[c]

Having thus briefly refuted the pretences on which the doctrine of Indulgences is advocated by Romanists, and shewn its origin; it remains to adduce some further arguments in opposition to this error.

First then, the doctrine of Indulgences as taught by you and commonly received by Romanists, has never been defined by any Council; for even the Council of Trent affirms nothing on the subject except that Indulgences are *useful;*[d] and does not assert that they are remissions of temporal penalties due to remitted sin.

Secondly, the Eastern Church, and the ancient societies of the Nestorians and Monophysites in the East, are strangers to the Romish doctrine and practice in regard to Indulgences.

Thirdly, the doctrine of Idulgences is so far from contributing to Christian Sanctity, that it is very injurious to it in several respects.

In my first Letter it was alleged, that "Indulgences are made to take the place which Scripture and Tradition assigns only to considerations connected with the eternal state; that they are presented to the consciences and hopes of your people, to influence them to the performance of duties which ought only to be urged on the motives of the love and fear of God."[e] I stated that "your confraternities, your charitable and religious works of all kinds, are virtually dependent on them."[f] You reply to this, that "the way in which the true value of the gift may be estimated, is by its fruits"—that my last statement is a "powerful testimony" to the "value" of Indulgences[g]—that

[c] Morinus De Pœnitentia, lib. x. cap. 22.

[d] Cum potestas conferendi Indulgentias à Christo Ecclesiæ concessa sit; atque hujusmodi potestate, divinitùs sibi tradita, antiquissimis etiam temporibus illa usa fuerit: sacro-sancta synodus Indulgentirum usum Christiano populo maximè salutarem, et sacrorum conciliorum auctoritate probatum in Ecclesia retinendum esse docet et præcipit: eosque anathemate damnat, qui aut inutiles esse asserunt, vel eas concedendi in Ecclesia potestatem esse negant &c. Conc. Trid. Sessio xxv.

[e] Letter i. p. 23. [f] Ibid. p. 25. [g] Remarks, &c. p. 74.

the country "will be most like the Church of God" in which works of charity and piety, even performed with the stimulant of Indulgences, "are done, not the one in which they are neglected."[h]

It would seem from these answers, as if it had never occurred to you, that the value of a work in God's sight is to be estimated by its intention or motive. You yourselves allow, that the good works of an unbeliever are not so pleasing to God as to be meritorious of eternal life, because he is without proper motives in performing them. He does not perform those works to the glory of God. If unlawful motives or intentions mingle with good ones in the performance of a good work by any Christian, that work is partly or wholly vitiated, and becomes displeasing to God.

Now I maintain that the desire of gaining an Indulgence for the remission of temporal penalties remaining due to the Divine justice after sin has been pardoned, is an *unlawful* motive to the performance of any work; because it supposes, contrary to the Catholic truth, that God is still unreconciled to those who are in a state of grace; that His justice has still demands, after it has been satisfied by the due application of Christ's infinite merits; and that the justified are objects of his wrath and vengeance. Any work based on such impressions, or whose motives include such impressions, cannot but be displeasing to God.

But every work wrought to obtain an Indulgence must be wrought with such views, for as Bouvier Bishop of Mans informs us, "All the authors agree that, in order to gain an Indulgence, it is *necessary to have a real intention of gaining it;* whence they conclude that in doing a work to which an Indulgence is attached, but without thinking of it, or having had positively the intention of obtaining it, nothing is gained."[i] Consequently, in the performance of all works to which Indulgences are annexed, there must be an intention of gaining Indulgences, this is, of obtaining remission of penalties remaining due after sin is remitted and justification imparted.

And hence we may see at once the weakness of your defence of Indulgences. Suppose if you please, that a greater number of works are produced by Indulgences than would be performed without them—does this really increase the sanctity of a Church? does it render it more like the Church of God? No: such works are actually more or less *displeasing* to God; and be their number what it may, the sanctity of Churches and of

[h] Ibid. p. 75. [i] Bouvier, Traité des Indulg. p. 87

individuals is diminished by them instead of being increased. It would have been far better for men to produce a small number of works on *pure* motives, well-pleasing to God, than to have performed a multitude on impure and unsanctified motives.

But besides this, Indulgences as actually practised in the Roman Church, are positively injurious to religion, by encouraging a number of devotions which are of a superstitious or even idolatrous character. The most objectionable prayers and addresses to Saints and Angels, recognising them as the sources of grace, the objects of our hope and confidence, and placing them on a level with God; the most vain repetitions of forms; and the practice of customs which are subversive of true and intelligent devotion, are all supported by Indulgences, and made to take the place of great religious duties. It is of such things that Fleury so justly speaks in the following passage.

"New devotions introduced by some Monks have tended to the same effect of *diminishing the horror of sin*, and *causing the reformation of morals to be neglected*. One may carry a *scapular*, and say every day *the Rosary*, or some *famous prayer*, without pardoning one's enemies, restoring property acquired by evil means, or forsaking immorality. Such are the devotions which the populace love: which do not engage them to improvement. . . . Thence also comes *external devotion to the Sacrament*. Men prefer to adore it when exposed to view, or to follow it in *procession*, rather than prepare themselves to communicate worthily.

"Since manual labour has ceased amongst the Monks, they have exceedingly extolled *mental prayer*, which is in effect the soul of religion, since it is the actual exercise of adoration in spirit and in truth, prescribed by Jesus Christ Himself. But it is easy to abuse it, and in this consisted chiefly the heresy of the Massalians condemned in the fourth century. . . . The Fratricelli of later times resembled them much, and amongst Catholics even, *mental prayer has served as a pretext for many abuses*. . . . God alone knows the employment of one who remains for an hour or two on his knees with his arms crossed. This lazy, and consequently *equivocal* devotion, has been the most common for about five hundred years, particularly amongst women, who are naturally more indolent and of a livelier imagination."[k]

Such are the devotions which Indulgences support and render universal in the Roman Communion; and while the belief in Indulgences remains, so long will all those practices, thus sanctioned and encouraged, continue to flourish in rank luxuriance.

[k] Fleury, Discours viii. sur l'Hist. Eccl. § 15.

But you are disposed to deny, it seems, that Indulgences do really form the motive to your various works. You assert that "Confraternities, &c. do *not* depend upon Indulgences"[l]—that Indulgences are not "proposed as motives of good works, or considered such by Romanists."[m]

These assertions, however, will be of little avail against the facts which have been produced. It has been shewn that the *desire* of obtaining Indulgences must be a distinct motive in performing works to which Indulgences are attached, in order to obtain Indulgences. It has been shewn that all religious and charitable works amongst you have Indulgences annexed; and it has been further shewn, that the desire for Indulgences is so general, that the best works cannot be performed without their aid; that you are obliged to be continually on your guard against forged and spurious Indulgences; and that the doctrine of Romanists necessarily obliges them to spend their lives in labours to obtain Indulgences. This being so, it follows that the desire of obtaining Indulgences, must enter into the motives which influence Romanists in their works generally, and consequently that those works are not well pleasing to God.

I have thus very cursorily touched on some of the principal features of this important subject, but am ready to discuss it with you at greater length, whenever it may suit your convenience.

I remain, Sir, yours, &c.

WILLIAM PALMER.

Oxford, Jan. 13th, 1842.

[l] Remarks, &c. p. 75.

[m] Ibid. p. 76.

AN

EIGHTH LETTER

TO

N. WISEMAN, D. D.

ON THE

WORSHIP OF IMAGES AND RELICS.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M. A.

OF WORCESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

BALTIMORE:

JOSEPH ROBINSON,

110 BALTIMORE STREET.

1843.

AN EIGHTH LETTER, &c.

Sir,

There is no charge which Romanists are more ready to repel with indignation and scorn than that of *idolatrous worship of images and relics.* When such a subject is even hinted at, we are absolutely overpowered with a torrent of invective, sarcasm, ridicule; with appeals to our common sense, our charity, our decency; with the boldest assertions of innocence; nay even with anathemas against idolatry. This extreme sensibility on the subject of image-worship will, to the discerning mind, indicate the consciousness of some unsoundness, some lurking feeling that all is not as it should be. Were Romanism in truth as free from idolatry as its advocates would have us believe, we should find them more at ease on the subject than they seem to be.

Let us cite a few passages in illustration of what has been said.

I shall first produce your own language. You are quite indignant on this occasion.

"Nor yet, my brethren, is this the worst feature of the case; for a graver and more awful charge is laid upon us in consequence of our belief: we are even denounced as idolaters, because we pay a certain reverence, and, if you please, worship, to the Saints of God, and because we honour their outward emblems and representatives. Idolaters! Know ye, my brethren, the import of this name? that it is the most frightful charge that can be laid to the score of any Christian? Then, gracious God! what must it be when flung as an accusation upon those who have been baptized in the name of Christ, who have tasted the sacred gift of His body, &c. Assuredly they know not what they say who deliberately and directly make this enormous charge; and they have to answer for *misrepresentation*, yea, for *calumny of the blackest dye*, who hesitate not again and again to repeat, with heartless earnestness and perseverance, this most *odious* of accusations, without being fully assured (which they cannot be) in their consciences and before God, that it really can be proved. . . . You will not open *a single Catholic writer*, from the folio decrees of Councils, down to the smallest catechism, placed in the hands of the youngest child-

ren, in which you will not find it expressly taught, that it is sinful to pay the same homage or worship to the Saints, or to the greatest of the Saints, or the highest of the Angels in heaven, which we pay to God,"[a] &c. &c.

Let us next hear the Declaration of "the Vicars Apostolic."

"*Ignorance* or *malice* has gone so far as to charge the Catholic Church with *idolatry* in the worship of the Saints, and of the images of Christ and of the Saints. The Catholic Church teaches that idolatry is one of the greatest crimes that can be committed against the majesty of God; and every true member of this Church *shudders at the idea of such a crime*, and feels grievously injured by so horrid an imputation. . . . To *worship* the images of Christ or of the Saints, the word is here again understood by Catholics only of an *inferior* and relative respect shewn to images. . . . To condemn this relative regard for images or pictures, would be to condemn the very feelings of nature. To charge a Catholic with idolatry because the term *worship*, meaning only an inferior and relative regard, is found in the ancient and modern Liturgies of his Church, is not consistent with *candour* or *charity*. The charge that the Catholic Church sanctions the praying to images is a calumny, and carries with it an imputation of stupidity too gross to be noticed,"[b] &c.

Dr. Baines shall speak next.

"You have been told that 'Romanists worship images, as did the pagans of old, and that, like them, they give the glory of the eternal God to the works of men's hands.' I know how common such accusations are, and how *otherwise* respectable are the sources from which they spring, or I should fear to *insult your understandings* by supposing that any of *you* are capable of believing them. For is it possible that in an age and country which claims to be so learned and enlightened, men should be found capable of believing that the majority of the Christian world are so ignorant, so debased, so stupid, so *wicked*, as to give divine honours to a lifeless and senseless image? Really, my Christian brethren, I blush to think it should be necessary to say that Catholics, as well as you, know the folly, and detest as much as you, the impiety of giving divine honours to a lifeless piece of wood or ivory. . . . I shall then merely add, in the words of St. Paul, in conformity with the

[a] Wiseman, Controv. Lectures, vol. ii. pp. 93, 94. I cannot but admire the ingenuity of this disclaimer. You deny that divine honours are due to the *Saints* or their *images*; but you *forget to notice our charge*, that divine honours are paid to Images of Christ and to the cross.

[b] Declaration of Vicars Apostolic, 1826, Section iv.

repeated decisions of the Catholic Church, and *in unison with the voice of every Catholic in the world*, anathema to the man who worships an image as God, or gives to it divine honours,[c] or believes it to possess any portion of divine power or virtue, or places his trust in it, or prays to it, or believes it to be any thing more than a lifeless, senseless lump of matter. . . . And, my brethren, I will add, without hesitation or fear, anathema to myself if the doctrine I have here explained to you is not the true and universally received doctrine of the Catholic Church."[d]

But Sir, notwithstanding all these vehement protestations, it is clear, by your own admissions and by those of other Romanists, that the Roman Church is not so perfectly immaculate as you would lead us to suppose.

We have first the following admission, "I shall be told that the manner in which the poorer Catholics pray before her (the Virgin's) *images* and those of the Saints, betrays *a greater fervour of devotion than they display at other times;* nay, that it even indicates a superstitious trust in those outward symbols themselves. This appearance may be partly *true*."[e]

Nor is it merely that *appearances* are against you, a truth which every traveller is ready to attest, but Roman Catholics themselves are obliged to admit, that those appearances are not fallacious; in short, that there are *real abuses* in the Roman communion on this subject.

"Experience," says Van Espen, "has long ago taught how difficult it is to guard against irreligious or superstitious worship, *in some degree savouring of idolatry*, in this public and external veneration of images and statutes, especially when the base gain of the priests mingles itself with it, combined with the ignorance or excessive credulity of the people. . . . Indeed, notwithstanding many decrees of Councils, and especially the salutary regulations of the Council of Trent, *so great and so various is the superstitious, and (as it were) idolatrous worship of images and statues*, amongst the common and unlearned people, that the Gallican bishops (in the ninth century) do not seem to have had unfounded apprehensions that the unlearned populace would be with difficulty withdrawn from the superstitious worship and unfitting adoration of images, if their worship

[c] Dr. Baines, following the general doctrine of Roman Catholic divines, denies that divine honour or Latria is due to images simply *per se*. This does not by any means imply that he refuses them such honour where they are considered as *representing* their originals. This distinction will be noticed further on.

[d] P. A. Baines, D D., Sermon on Faith, Hope and Charity.

[e] Wiseman, Letter to Newman, p. 24.

were allowed. . . . It is certain that the manifold superstitious worship of holy images owes, for the greater part if not entirely, its origin, progress, and stability, to the filthy lucre of priests, either secular or regular, which they seek from the popular concourse and indiscreet affection of the people to certain images."[f]

The same evils were acknowledged by the learned Gerson, in the fifteenth century. "Judge," said he, "whether so great a variety of images and pictures in the Church be expedient, and whether they do not sometimes pervert numbers of the unlearned people to idolatry."[g]

This, Sir, explains in some degree the irritation which Romish authors invariably display when the subject of idolatry is mentioned. But let us examine the subject a little more closely, and enquire whether superstitious and *idolatrous* practices in reference to images and relics are mere *abuses* in the Church of Rome, or whether they are not taught, allowed, and sanctioned by the highest authorities amongst you.

I undertake then to demonstrate that, notwithstanding all your disclaimers, DIRECT AND FORMAL IDOLATRY—WHAT YOU YOURSELVES ADMIT TO BE IDOLATRY—IS AUTHORIZED AND APPROVED IN YOUR COMMUNION, AND THAT YOU ARE PREVENTED BY YOUR OWN PRINCIPLES FROM CONDEMNING IT.

First then, what is idolatry, according to Romanists?

"It is the giving to man, or to any thing created, that homage, that adoration, and that worship, which God hath reserved unto Himself."[h] "Idolatry pays divine honour to creatures."[i] "Those only are idolaters who offer to a creature the honour and worship due to God."[k] Idolatry is, according to Ligorio, "when honour is given to the creature as to God. This is done (as Lessius teacheth) not merely by sacrifice, but also by any sign of honour, by which any one intends to submit himself to a creature as to God, e. g. by genuflexion, offering incense, uncovering the head," &c.[l] It is, according to Amort, "the adoration of a creature as God."[m] Thomas Aquinas remarks that idolatry is a species of superstition, "which is chiefly practised when divine worship is attributed to one to whom it is not due; but it ought to be paid only to

[f] Van Espen Opera, tom. ii. pp. 240, 241. ed. Lovan. 1732.
[g] Gerson, Defect. Eccl. n. 67. tom. i. Opera, p. 207, Ed. Paris. 1606.
[h] Wiseman, Controv. Lectures, ii. 93.
[i] Hornyhold, Real Principles of Catholics, p. 150.
[k] Trevern, Discuss. Amicale, tom. ii. p. 276.
[l] Ligorio, Theologia Moralis, l. iii. n. 12.
[m] Amort, Theologia, tom. xx. p. 272.

the supreme, uncreated God."[n] I need not pursue this point any further. All your writers, without a single exception, agree that idolatry consists in offering to creatures that supreme worship which is only due to God. Secondly. What, according to Romanists, is the supreme worship due to God, or how is it designated by them?

Bellarmine says, "There are as many sorts of adoration or worship as there are species of excellence. But, as far as relates to the present purpose, there are three species of excellence. The first is the *Divine* and *infinite* excellence, to which corresponds the first species of worship, which is called by theologians LATRIA."[o] "It is to be observed," says Tournely, "that there are three sorts of adoration or worship, LATRIA, which is due to God only; *Dulia*, which is due to creatures; *Hyperdulia*, which is bestowed on the blessed Virgin."[p] "The words LATRIA and Dulia have been rightly employed to discriminate properly the supreme worship due to God only, from the inferior worship with which Angels or Saints are honoured."[q] "There are some of the common people," said the Wallenburghs, "who often understand the word 'adoration' as signifying *the highest honour due to God, which we call* LATRIA, or as meaning the adoration of Latria, which however has been taught by no Council. Nay rather, the Second Synod of Nice says that images are to be adored, but it adds, *not with Latria.*"[r] In like manner you cite the following words of St. Augustine, as exhibiting the same distinction which is made by Romanists. "We venerate the martyrs . . . But with that worship which the Greeks call λατρείαν, and which in Latin cannot be expressed by one word—as it is a worship properly due only to the Divinity—*with that worship we worship God alone.*"[s] Trevern, in remarking on a decree of the second Synod of Nice which Romanists receive as œcumenical, says, "The Council distinguishes by these certain characters, the adoration *due to God alone*, from those which may be paid to other objects: it calls the first, the adoration of LATRIA, which pertains *exclusively to God.*"[t]

I ought to apologize for pressing on the attention of the reader a distinction so well known, and so universally received by all your writers. If you are charged with paying idolatrous wor-

[n] Aquinas, Summa Theologiæ, Secunda Secundæ, quæst. xciv. art. 1.
[o] Bellarmin. de Sanct. Beatit. l. i. c. xii.
[p] Tournely, De Incarnatione, p. 782.
[q] Perrone, De cultu Creat. cap. i. Præl. Theol. tom. iv. p. 341.
[r] Wallenburch, Controvers. tom. ii. p. 206.
[s] Wiseman, Controv. Lect. ii. 113.
[t] Trevern, Discuss. Amic. tom. ii. p. 323.

ship to images or relics, you are ready with your reply, "that no calumny can be more gross, *because* the honour which you give to images and relics, is infinitely inferior to, is altogether different from, that true LATRIA which you only pay to God."

And, Sir, I am ready to concede, that as far as *theory* goes, Romanists are not guilty of the monstrous absurdity of paying divine worship or LATRIA to stocks and stones *per se*, or even to *Saints* and *Angels* when *they* are represented. To do them justice, Romanists are careful enough, in their theological writings, and especially in controversies with us, to draw distinctions between the Latria which they pay to God, and the Hyperdulia, and the Dulia which they pay to the Virgin, and to all other Saints and their images. I do not charge you then with advocating *in theory*, the lawfulness of offering divine honours to the images or relics of *the Saints*,[u] nor do I say, that you teach the people to *pray to* images. There is quite enough in your principles and practice to excite our most serious alarm for your condition, without imputing to you any thing which you can fairly rebut and deny.

But what I do mean to assert and maintain is this; that LATRIA—the very honour due to *God alone* by your own confession, is paid to creatures in the Church of Rome—that this worship has been openly avowed and recommended by your most eminent divines—that it is a lawful practice amongst you sanctioned by authority—that it has never been censured—that it cannot be condemned by any Romanist.

But to descend to particulars; I undertake to demonstrate, that, according to the doctrine of your most eminent theologians, *approved by the Roman Church*, LATRIA, or *Divine worship* is due to the following creatures. *Images* of Christ; of the Trinity; of God the Father. *Relics* of the blood of Christ; of His nails; His hair; His flesh; of the true Cross; of the nails which fastened him to it; of the spear; the scourge; the reed; the sponge; of the napkin of Veronica; of the linen cloth in which our Lord was wound; of the coat without seam; of the purple robe; of the pillar to which He was bound when He was scourged; of the inscription on the Cross. *Images* of the true Cross of any material, such as wood, metal, or ivory. *The blessed Virgin*, and her *images* and *relics*. *The Scriptures*. To all these created objects, LATRIA or *the honour due to God only*, is formally, expressly, and professedly paid in the Roman Communion.

These points shall be immediately established by quotations from your most eminent divines; and as you are for ever assert-

[u] I must except the Virgin, for as it will hereafter be seen, some Romish theologians are of opinion that Latria is due to her.

ing that the decrees of the Council of Trent in regard to images have entirely prevented the possibility of idolatry, I shall only cite from writers who have lived since that Council was celebrated.

1. I shall commence with Azorius.

"The first question is, Whether the *Cross* and *Image* of Christ our Lord ought to be adored with the worship of LATRIA? There are four opinions of the doctors, but in my judgment they may be reduced to two, as I shall hereafter say.

"The first opinion denies it; so that, according to this opinion, the worship of Latria is referred, as to its term, to Christ, contained in the image only by thought or meditation; and the Image or Cross is only that, in which, or by which, we worship *Christ*, so that it may be truly said, we do not worship the Cross or the Image of Christ with Latria, but Christ himself in the Cross or Image."[x]

He remarks that Alexander, Durandus, Holcot, and Mirandula, are all said to have been of this opinion.

"The second opinion affirms that they, (the *Images* and *Cross*,) OUGHT TO BE WORSHIPPED WITH THE ADORATION OF LATRIA, that is, with the same worship, honour, and veneration, with which Christ, whose image it is, is worshipped; for it saith, that in a Cross or Image *three* things may be considered; First, the mere substance of the sign or image in its own nature and *per se*, which is matter, i. e. wood, gold, silver, or stone; and in this respect it is not capable of veneration or worship. The second is, the figure, relation, and order, by which a sign, or image is referred to the original which it represents; for what represents and what is represented, are mutually related: in which way also the worship of Latria is by no means due; because this order and relation is something created, really distinct from Christ, the prototype and original. The third is, that the image actually refers to and *represents* Christ, AND IN THIS MANNER, saith Cajetan, THE WORSHIP OF LATRIA, IS DUE TO IT; so that the worship is referred as well to the IMAGE which represents, as to Christ whose similitude it bears."[y]

This opinion he says, "*is received by the common consent of Theologians*, as St. Thomas, Alexander de Hales, Bonaventure,

x Azorii Institut. Moral. tom. i. lib. ix. c. vi.

y Secunda opinio affirmat coli debere adoratione Latriæ, hoc est eodem cultu, honore, et veneratione qua colitur Christus, cujus est imago: ait enim, in Cruce vel Imagine posse tria considerari . . . . Tertium est, Imaginem actu Christum ipsum referre et repræsentare, et hoc modo inquit Cajetanus 3. par. 9. 25. Art. 3. cultus Latriæ ei est debitus. Ita ut cultus tùm ad imaginem repræsentantem, ùm ad Christum cujus similitudinem gerit, referatur. Azorius, *ubi supra*.

Ricardus, Albertus Magnus, Paludanus, Almain, Marsilius, Major, Capreolus, and the other more recent writers."

"The third opinion is that of Gabriel Biel, who asserts that worship is due to the cross and Image of Christ, but not that of Latria properly, but improperly and in a general signification, or by a sort of analogy and similitude."

"The fourth opinion *distinguishes* in this manner. When the image is worshipped on account of that which it represents, it is the worship of *Latria;* but when on account of itself . . . it is not the worship of Latria but Dulia."[z]

It may be observed here, that Latria is admitted in some sense to be due to the *Cross* or *Image* of Christ by the advocates of three out of four opinions, which, according to Azorius, exist amongst Romish theologians.

Azorius, who upholds the *second* opinion, then considers the objections which may be advanced against it from the decrees of the second Nicene Synod, and remarks that "the Synod suggests that a two-fold worship is to be paid to a Cross; of LATRIA, on account of the original which it represents, and of Dulia, on account of the sanctity as it were inherent in it. . . . . On the other hand it is *the constant judgment of Theologians* that the image should be honoured and worshipped with the same honour and veneration with the original; and *the Council of Trent* seems to intimate this, Sess. XXV. In decreto fidei de sacris imaginibus." So that the image of Christ is to be adored with Latria.

We have thus seen, that the *true Cross* of Christ and the *Image* of Christ are to be adored with Latria. Let us next see what is said of other matters.

Azorius enquires, "Whether, as a Cross of any material is worthy of the worship of Latria, so also the *nails, spear, scourges, sponge,* and *crown of thorns,* made of any materials, ought to be worshipped with LATRIA. St. Thomas replies, that a Cross of any material ought to be worshipped with Latria, because not only the Cross on which Jesus Christ hung, is worthy of that worship because it *touched Christ;* but also inasmuch as it is a Cross, that is, a sign and image of Christ hanging on the Cross; but the other instruments of our Lord's Passion only deserve the worship of LATRIA, because they touched the body of Christ."[a]

[z] Azorius, *ubi supra.*

[a] Quæritur, An quemadmodum Crux cujuslibet materiæ cultu Latriæ digna est, sic etiam clavi, lancea, flagella, spongia et corona spinea ex alia quælibet materia confecta, cultu Latriæ coli debeant. S. Thomas . . . respondet, Crucem ex qualibet materia constantem.

Hence it follows that any *relics* of such instruments are to be adored with Latria, though images of them are not to be so.

Another question is, "Whether, if any portion of the *blood* shed in the death of Christ, which Christ did not resume when He came to life, should exist any where, it ought to be worshipped with LATRIA. From what St. Thomas has taught, it is deduced, that it *ought* to be worshipped; because, although separated from the Divine Word, it yet *touched* the body of Christ; so that if any of His *hairs* existed any where, or any little *particles of his flesh* separated by circumcision, they would deserve the worship of LATRIA."[b]

There are many alleged relics of our Saviour in existence, such as hairs, drops of His blood, parings of His nails, the prepuce, the napkin of St. Veronica, &c. &c.; all of which are, according to this doctrine, to be worshipped with LATRIA.

In fine, Azorius states his own belief to be, that the worship due to images is, "LATRIA, if we worship the image of Christ; Hyperdulia if it be the image of the Virgin; or Dulia if we worship the images of the Saints dwelling in heaven."[c]

2. The next Theologian to whom I shall appeal is Cabrera. In speaking of the different opinions of Roman Catholic Divines on this point, he says, that the "First is, that images are to be adored on account of the prototype; yet not with the same adoration, but with another inferior." He cites some writers who held this opinion, and who thought that the image of Christ should not be adored with Latria, or else that Latria should be only offered to it *analogicâ*."[d]

"The second opinion teaches that the same adoration altogether should be exhibited to the images and the things they represent; so that the Image of Christ is to be adored with the LATRIA with which Christ Himself is worshipped; that of the Virgin with Hyperdulia; and so of the rest.

coli debere Latria, quia eo cultu non solum Crux quâ Christus pependit digna est, eò quod Christum tetigerit; sed etiam quatenus Crux est, hoc est signum et imago Christi in Cruce pendentis; at verò cætera Dominicæ passionis instrumenta solùm cultum Latriæ merentur quia Christi corpus tetigerunt. Azorius, Ibid.

[b] Quæritur, An si alicubi superesset aliqua portio sanguinis in morte Christi effusi, quam Christus redivivus non resumpserit, coli deberet Latria? Ex his quæ tradidit S. Thomas . . . . deducitur coli debere, quia etsi à Verbo Divino esset reipsa disjunctus, tetigit tamen corpus Christi; ut si aliqui capilli ejusdem uspiam extarent, aut aliquæ exiguæ particulæ carnis per circumcisionem abscissæ, cultum Latriæ mererentur. Azorius, Ibid.

[c] Si sit imago Christi, est Latriæ: si Deiparæ, hyperduliæ: si aliorum sanctorum cum Christo in cœlo viventium, duliæ. Ibid.

[d] Pet. de Cabrera, in iii. part S. Thomæ, Commen. tom. ii. p. 639. Ed. 1602.

This, he says, is the doctrine of St. Thomas, Cajetan, Capreolus, Paludanus, Ferrariensis, St. Antoninus, Soto, "*and almost all the ancient Theologians;*" of Alexander Alensis, Albertus Magnus, Bonaventure, Richard St. Victor, Dionysius Carthusianus, Major, Marsilius, Waldensis, Tunecremata, Angestus against Luther, Clichtovæus, Turrianus, Vasquez, "and many others more recently."[e]

This doctrine is, according to Cabrera, proved from the *Council of Trent*, from "*the Seventh Synod*," from the Fathers, &c.; and he maintains that it is "most true, most pious, and very consonant to the decrees of faith."[f]

Cabrera replies to all the objections which are alleged from the Councils of Nice and Trent, and establishes the above doctrine from both of those Councils.[g] He even maintains that it is *de fide*.

"From this explanation of the Council of Nice, collected from the Fathers, it seems to follow that *it is a dogma of the faith*, that the image of Christ and the Cross also, are to be adored with LATRIA; although it seems to many in this age, that it has not yet been defined by a Council, but only that images should be honoured with due veneration; but that it has not been defined what this veneration should be."[h]

With more particular reference to the Cross, Cabrera deduces from St. Thomas Aquinas the following conclusions.

"First—The Cross on which Christ was crucified is to be adored with LATRIA, both because it represents the form of Christ extended on it, and because it was sanctified by the contact of the members of Christ, and bathed in His blood."[i] The proof is as follows: "The adoration of LATRIA is due to that thing in which the hope of salvation is placed, but the hope of salvation is placed in the Cross of Christ, according to that hymn of the Church, 'O Crux ave, spes unica,' &c. Therefore, &c. Secondly, because we speak to it (the Cross) and entreat it, as if it were Christ crucified Himself."[k]

[e] Ib. p. 641.

[f] Ib. p. 644.

[g] Ib. p. 646.

[h] Ex hac explicatione Concilii Nicæni collecti ex Patribus videtur sequi, esse dogma fidei, quod Christi imago et similiter Crux sit adoranda Latria. p. 647.

[i] Prima conclusio. Crux in qua Christus crucifixus est, utroque modo adoranda est *Latria*, et quia *repræsentat* formam Christi in ea extensi, et quia *contactu membrorum* Christi sanctificata est, et ejus sanguine perfusa, p. 651.

[k] Illi rei debetur adoratio Latriæ in qua spes salutis ponitur, sed in Christi cruce ponitur salutis spes, juxta illud quod canit Ecclesia, O Crux ave spes unica &c. Ergo. Secundo, quia eam alloquimur et deprecamur quasi ipsum Crucifixum. Ibid.

"Secondly—The *image* of the Cross of Christ, of any materials, is to be adored with LATRIA,"[l] &c.

It may be here observed, that the above argument from the *language* applied to the Cross would equally go to prove that the Virgin and Saints are adored with Latria, as I have produced in my first and fifth Letter many addresses to them, which fully equal what Aquinas cites in reference to the Cross. We may therefore claim Aquinas himself as a testimony to the idolatrous character of those addresses to the Saints.

Cabrera establishes the first of the above conclusions from Scripture and the Fathers, "whence," he says, "it is evident that the Cross on which Christ hung is to be adored with LATRIA, on account of the contact of the members of Christ; because, on this consideration alone, (setting aside its being an image) it is a *relic* of Christ our Lord; but it is certain that relics are to be adored, as will appear in Article 6. Whence, as the adoration of Latria seems to me to have been defined as a *matter of faith*, to be due to the *images* of Christ, so also I think of His *Cross*. And a most cogent reason may also be deduced from the received custom of the Church, which addresses the Cross itself as she does Christ crucified."[m]

He observes that the opinion of those who deny that Latria is due to the Cross, or that honour is only due to it in remembrance of Christ, is *erroneous*, and ought to be rejected.

Cabrera maintains that the *second* conclusion, cited above, is "also to be held *as a matter of faith*,"[n] i. e. that a Cross of any material is to be adored with LATRIA.

With reference to the *images* of the nails, &c., he holds, with Aquinas, that they are not to be worshipped with LATRIA. He reserves that worship for those objects themselves. "In the third degree are those things which by contact with our Lord partook of His holiness, and remained dignified even in the estimation of believers; as the Cross, nails, thorns, spear, &c.; and these are to be adored with LATRIA."[o]

[l] Secunda conclusio. Effigies Crucis Christi in quacumque alia materia, est adoranda Latria. Ibid.

[m] Unde sicut nobis visa est definita adoratio Latriæ de imaginibus Christi secundum fidem, sic etiam de Cruce. Et habetur etiam argumentum firmissimum ex consuetudine recepta ab Ecclesia, quæ . . . ipsam Crucem alloquitur atque ipsum Christum crucifixum. p. 653.

[n] Secunda conclusio D. Thomæ est similiter *de fide* tenenda definita in 6 Synodo can. 73 and 77. 7 Synodo, et 8 Synodo. Ibid.

[o] In tertio gradu sunt illa, quæ ex contactu Domini sanctitatem ejus participaverunt, et manserunt dignificata etiam in æstimatione fidelium, ut crux, clavi, spinæ, lancea, &c. Et hæc sunt adoranda Latria. p. 654.

It might be naturally imagined that if the Cross was to be adored with Latria on account of its contact with Christ, other objects might be regarded as entitled to the same worship. And here of course the Blessed Virgin will at once occur to the mind. Accordingly we find that there are various theologians who are of opinion that she is entitled to Latria. Cabrera shall speak on this very important point.

After citing from Thomas Aquinas the following conclusion, "The Mother of Christ is not to be adored with Latria, but with hyperdulia," he observes that, "The first part of this conclusion is a dogma of faith, since the opposite is the heresy of the Collyridians, (as Epiphanius relates, Hær. 78 et 79), who worshipped the Blessed Virgin as God, and offered sacrifices to her . . . But whether, by reason of her *contact* with the body of Christ and the consanguinity which she had with Christ, she may be in some way adored with LATRIA, has not been defined by the Church, *but is a matter of controversy with theologians.* On the affirmative side, the first argument is, that the insignia of Christ's Passion, such as the Cross, spear, crown of thorns, &c. are adored with Latria on account of their *contact ;* but the Virgin Mother of God was more closely united with Christ than the Cross, &c. Secondly, because she was the *Mother* of Christ, and therefore should be adored with the same veneration as the King Himself. Thirdly, because titles are given to the blessed Virgin which are only due to God; therefore Latria ought to be paid her with these titles; or if it be not, the titles should not be either," &c.[p]

It may here be observed that according to the generally received principle that the same honour is due to images and relics as to their originals, it follows that the images and relics of the Virgin are to be adored with Latria.

Cabrera produces the arguments of Aquinas in opposition, and thus continues. "Cajetan understands this to be the opinion

[p] An verò ratione *contactus* corporis Christi, et propter sanguinis conjunctionem, quam cum Christo habuit, possit aliqua ratione adorari *Latria*, non est ab Ecclesia definitum, sed est positum *in controversia theologorum.* Pro parte affirmativa est primum argumentum ; quia ratione contactus adorantur Latria insignia passionis Christi, ut Crux, lancea, corona spinea, &c. Sed Deipara Virgo fuit Christo conjunctior quam crux, &c. Ergo. Secundo, quia fuit mater Christi; ergo adoranda est eadem veneratione. qua Rex. Tertio, quia beatissimæ Virgini tribuuntur tituli qui solo Deo debeantur, ergo cum hujusmodi titulis debet illi exhiberi Latria, aut si Latria non deferatur, neque tituli debent deferri, &c. Cabrera, p. 665.

The *second* of these reasons will remind you of the language and illustrate the meaning of the Tipperary farmer mentioned in my first Letter.

of St. Thomas, not absolutely and simply, but by reason of *scandal* or *danger;* in the absence of which he admits that the blessed Virgin may be worshipped with the adoration of LATRIA in respect of her *contact* alone. *Other theologians* are of opinion that she may be adored with LATRIA, not merely on account of *contact,* but also on account of her maternity and consanguinity."[q]

It may be easily inferred from the following sentiments of Alphonso de Ligorio, that there must be a large number of persons in the Roman Communion who would be disposed to receive the doctrine that Latria is due to the blessed Virgin. "When an opinion honourable to the holy Virgin is discussed, if this opinion be neither repugnant to faith, nor to the decisions of the Church, and that it has some foundation, some support; to reject, to combat it, merely because the other sentiment may be also true, demonstrates very little either love or respect for the Mother of God."[r] Since then the opinion that Latria is due to the Virgin on account of her contact and consanguinity with our Lord may be lawfully held by Romanists, it cannot be doubtful that the votaries of the Virgin must regard it as a sort of duty to adopt, or at least to favour that opinion.

Cabrera himself does not agree with this opinion, but he does not presume to censure it.

It further appears from his statement, that the name of Jesus and the *Scriptures* are, according to some theologians, to be worshipped with LATRIA.

"It is doubted, with regard to this and the preceding articles, what is to be said of the worship of the name of Jesus, of the names of God, and of the Holy Scripture. *Some answer in the very same manner as regards images,* because they are signs and notes, to which therefore the *same adoration is due as to the things signified.*"[s]

3. Gregory de Valentia maintains the following position. "Images are to be honoured with the same honour as their prototypes, and therefore the images of Christ's humanity are to be worshipped with LATRIA."[t]

q Hanc D. Thomæ sententiam intelligit Cajetanus hîc non absolutè et simpliciter, sed ratione scandali aut periculi, quo cessante concedit posse B. Virginem coli adoratione Latriæ ratione solius contactus. Alii theologi opinantur non solum ratione contactus, verum etiam ratione maternitatis propter sanguinis conjunctionem posse adorari Latria. p. 655.

r Glories of Mary, chap. v.

s Cabrera, *ubi supra,* p. 656.

t Gregorius de Valentia, Comment. in D. Thom. tom. iv. p. 339. Ed. Lugd. 1619.

"The question is whether the wood of the Cross and other things which are, as it were, relics of Christ, as the Sudarium, particles of His blood, and such like things, which are customarily shewn, ought to be honoured with LATRIA. . . . I reply, as of the images of Christ, whatever it be that is held on no light grounds to have had the habit of touching Christ, is most rightly honoured with Latria, not *per se*, but *per aliud*, as St. Thomas explains it . . . The very wood of the Cross ought to be honoured with Latria. So also the linen cloth or Sudarium of Christ is to be adored with Latria, and the nails, spear, &c. —So also any relics of the blood of Christ. But as far as relates to the Cross which is customarily formed of various materials, in imitation of that Cross on which Christ hung; it is also to be adored with LATRIA."[u]

4. Gretser, one of your most celebrated Theologians, writes thus.

"We have thus far shewn that the Cross of the Lord is to be worshipped: it is now to be explained more particularly with what species of worship not only the original Cross, but its images and signs, are to be adored. . . . We assert, in accordance with *the opinion which is more common*, and *generally received in the schools*, that the CROSS is to be worshipped with LATRIA, that is with DIVINE WORSHIP, not indeed *per se*, but *per aliud;* not absolutely, but with respect and relation to its prototype. To which opinion St. Thomas subscribes, and many of those who follow his doctrine, as Cajetan, Capreolus, Gregory de Valentia, and others not a few."[x] He then proves this doctrine at great length from tradition.

Gretser affirms that the same worship is due to all the instruments of our Lord's suffering—"the nails with which Christ was fixed to the Cross; the spear which pierced His

[u] Quæstio est utrum etiam lignum crucis et aliæ quasi Christi reliquiæ, ut sudarium, particulæ sanguinis, et similia quæ ostendi solent, debeant honorari Latria. . . . Respondeo, similiter ac de Christi imaginibus, quicquid est tale, quod non leviter existimatur habere ejusmodi habitudinem contactus ad Christum, rectissime honorari Latria, non per se, sed per aliud, ut Divus Thomas explicat. . . . Lignum ipsum crucis . . . honorari debet Latria. . . . Sic etiam Latria adorandum est Linteum sive sudarium Christi, et clavi, et lancea, &c. . . . Sic et sanguinis Christi reliquiæ aliquæ. . . . Quod verò attinet ad crucem quæ in similitudinem ejus crucis in qua Christus pependit formari solet ex variis materiis; adoranda illa quoque est Latria. Greg. de Valent. *ubi supra*, p. 343.

[x] Asserimus autem cum sententia communiori, et in scholis magis trita, crucem colendam esse Latria, hoc est, cultu Divino, non quidem per se, sed per aliud, &c. Jac. Gretserus, De Cruce, tom. i. p. 169. l. i. c. 57.

side, the sponge with which He was given to drink, the title of the Cross, the pillar to which he was bound when beaten with rods, and other instruments of the Lord's Passion consecrated by the touch or the blood of Christ."[y] To all of these the same worship is due. And we learn further from this writer, that these instruments are still in existence, and are worshipped in various parts of the world. The *nails* are to be found in various places.[z] There are relics of the *title of the Cross* at Rome and Toulouse.[a] Many *thorns* and fragments of the crown of thorns still subsist.[b] The *column* to which our Lord was tied is to be found in the Church of St. Praxedes at Rome, besides many fragments of the same which are shewn elsewhere.[c] The *reed* and *sponge* are at St. John Lateran, though part of the latter is also in France.[d] The *spear* is at Paris, and in other places.[e] The *napkin of Veronica*, with which our Lord dried His face, and on which its impress remained, is at Turin, together with the *linen cloth* in which He was wrapped in the tomb.[f] The *coat without seam* still exists, it seems, at Paris, Treves, and elsewhere,[g] not to speak of the *purple robe*,[h] and many other similar relics, all of which, together with those above mentioned, are, according to the doctrine of Aquinas and of the great body of Roman Catholic theologians, to be worshipped with Latria or Divine worship.

5. Vasquez maintains at length and with great learning, that the image must be worshipped with the *very same act of worship* as the original. "It is an exceedingly common and ancient doctrine of the divines, which I think true, that the motion of adoration towards the image, so passes into its prototype and original, that both are included under the same veneration; so that, not even in thought can the image be adored *per se* without the original, or separated from it."[i] He affirms that "the ancient scholastics . . . say absolutely that the images of Christ and of *the Trinity*, are to be worshipped with the adoration of LATRIA."[k]

y Gretser, *ubi supra*, c. 54. p. 161.
z Ibid. p. 284.
a Ibid. p. 286, 287. b Ibid. p. 288, 289. c Ibid. p. 290.
d Ibid. p. 290. e Ibid. p. 291-293. f Ibid. p. 295-297.
g Gretser, *ubi supra*, p. 300.
h Ibid. p. 301.
i Vasquez, De cultu Adorationis Libri tres, l. iii. disp. viii. c. 3. p. 283. Ed. Mogunt. 1594.
k Veteres scholastici . . . absolutè dicunt imagines Christi et Trinitatis esse colendas adoratione Latriæ. Disp. ix. c. i. p. 374.

6. Jacobus de Graffiis, Penitentiary at Naples, affirmed that "We should bestow LATRIA on the image of *God*, or of *Christ*, or the sign of the Cross."[l]

7. The same doctrine is taught by Francis de Sales. "In so far as (the Cross represents Christ crucified, and has been sprinkled with His blood, it is to be adored with the same adoration as Christ Himself, that is, with LATRIA."[m]

8. Bellarmine recognises the doctrine of Aquinas as existing in the Church. He states that "there are three opinions," as to the sort of worship due to images, the second of which is, "that the same honour is due to the image as to the original; and therefore that the image of Christ is to be adored with Latria."[n] He argues indeed that "as far as regards the manner of *speaking*, it should not be *said* (especially in Sermons to the people) that any images ought to be adored with Latria, but on the contrary that they ought not to be so adored."[o] But it is evident that he is only urging the necessity of *caution in the use of language*, so as to avoid giving offence. He does not attempt to shew that there is any error or sin in offering relative divine worship to the images of Christ. He argues that it is unadvisable to *speak* of offering such honours, because the Councils and Fathers have not used such language; because it may be dangerous to the people; and because "This mode of speaking offends the years of (some) Catholics, *and affords to heretics an occasion for blaspheming more boldly.*"[p] But as for *the thing itself*, he is of opinion that "it may be admitted that images may be worshipped *impropriè* or *per accidens*, with the same sort of worship as their original;"[q] or, as he explains it, that the image of Christ may be adored with the worship due to Christ Himself, not *per se*, but as it *represents* and *is in the place of* its original.[r] In fine, he shews that his view is in

[l] Ut unamquamque imaginem eodem cultu quo ille cujus imago est veneremur, id est, ut imagini Dei, vel Christi, vel etiam crucis signo prout Dominicam passionem ad mentem revocat, Latriam impartiamur. Jac. de Graffiis. Decisiones Aureæ, Pars i. l. ii. c. ii. p. 115. Ed. Taurini, 1597.

[m] Franc. Sales in Tract. Apologiæ de Vexillo Crucis præfixo.

[n] Bellarminus, De Reliquiis Sanct. lib. ii. c. xx.

[o] Secunda propositio, Quantum ad *modum loquendi*: præsertim in concione ad populum, non est *dicendum* imagines ullas adorari debere Latriâ, sed è contrario non debere sic adorari. Ibid. c. xxii.

[p] Quintò, iste modus loquendi offendit aures Catholicorum, et præbet occasionem hæreticis liberius blasphemandi. Ibid.

[q] Tertia propositio: Si de *re ipsa* agatur, admitti potest, imagines posse coli impropriè, vel per accidens, *eodem genere cultûs*, quo exemplar ipsum colitur. cap. xxiii.

[r] Ac primùm, quod imago possit coli impropriè eo cultu quo

accordance with that of Aquinas and the schoolmen generally: thus recognising their authority, and attesting the prevalence of their doctrine in the Church of Rome.

I shall pass over various proofs of the prevalence of such views which might be deduced from the writings of Turrianus, Stapleton, Costerus, Tannerus,[s] and others of your theologians, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and proceed to testimonies of a later date.

9. Amort, in his Theology, published under the auspices of Pope Benedict XIV. in 1752, distinctly maintains this doctrine. In reply to the question: "What is sufficient and requisite in order that the worship of LATRIA (respectively at least) be exhibited to any thing," answers thus: "It is sufficient and requisite that God desired to be honoured with an excellent worship *in that thing or image*, as the immediate instruments of our salvation and of His own glory. . . . It is moreover requisite that the thing should have been adopted by Christ to share in His glory, and commanded to be honoured, and that this should have been manifested to us by some sign either tacit or express. But this was manifested to us concerning all the parts of His body assumed to glory in the resurrection, and concerning His five wounds which He retained in glory, and concerning THE CROSS. . . . Since therefore Christ glories in His wounds and His Cross, and Christians also glory in it, it was fitting that God should desire the OTHER INSTRUMENTS, (i. e. the nails, sponge, &c.) of our salvation and His glory, (assumed to glory,) to be held by us in exceeding reverence,"[t] &c.

Hence it appears that the Cross and other instruments of Christ's Passion are to be adored with Latria, according to the doctrine of Aquinas. The same author allows that images of *God* and of the *Holy Trinity* may be publicly worshipped, provided that they are made in a certain manner;[u] and the con-

ipsum exemplar, probatur: nam aliquando imago accipitur *pro ipso exemplari*, et ea, quæ fierent circa ipsum exemplar si adesset præsens, fiunt circa imaginem, mente tamen defixâ in exemplari. . . . Tunc autem propriè nullus honor defertur imagini, sed soli exemplari: tamen *improprié* dici potest ipsa etiam imago honorari.

Quòd autem possit imago adorari adoratione ipsius exemplaris, propriè quidem, sed *per accidens*, probatur: nam aliquando . . . consideramus exemplar *ut objectivè relucet in imagine*: et ipsum sic repræsentatum, et quasi vestitum imagine veneramur, &c. Ibid.

[s] Turrianus, apud Cabrer. p. 641; Stapleton, Prompt. Cathol. part. i. p. 292; Coster. Enchirid. p. 438, 439; Tanner. in 2. 2. Thom. disp. 4. th. 48.

[t] Amort. Theologia, tom. xxi. p. 235-237.

[u] Ibid. p. 237.

text renders it evident that he considers Latria to be the proper worship due to such images.

10. The doctrine of Dens on this subject is of peculiar importance, as his work is an esteemed manual of the Romish priesthood in these countries at the present day. I shall therefore quote from this writer at some length.

"With what worship are the images of Christ and the Saints to be venerated?

"St. Thomas replies to the question, that images may be honoured *with the same worship with which their prototypes are honoured*, but only with a relative or respective worship: whence the images of Saints are worshipped with the respective worship of Dulia; those of the blessed Virgin with the relative worship of Hyperdulia; *those of* CHRIST *and of* GOD *with the respective worship of* LATRIA [Christi et Dei respectivo Latriæ cultu.] Many however maintain that this respective worship given to images ought to be less than the worship given to their prototypes: and hence they infer that the worship of Latria is due to no image. They depend on the seventh Synod, which says that Latria is not to be given to images because it befits the Divine nature only. But others explain the seventh Synod (as speaking) of *absolute* Latria, which is not due to the images of Christ, although the respective worship of Latria be due to them; and they are adored with honour less than that due to the prototype: which doctrines are not repugnant to each other. However it may be, let it be enough for us against the Sectaries, that all Catholics teach and prove that images of the Saints are to be venerated.[x]

"With what worship are relics honoured?

"In a mode and with a worship like that with which the images of Christ and the Saints are worshipped (according to what was said, Num. xxvii.) and thus, *with the same worship with which the person whose relics they are*, but a relative or respective worship. . . . Objection 2. A pious son does not honour the instruments of contumely with which his father was slain: therefore a Christian ought not to worship *the Cross, or the other instruments* of the death of Christ, or of the martyrs. . . . I deny it. . . . We worship *the Cross, &c.* . . . inasmuch as they were the instruments of the victorious Passion and exaltation, which were also sanctified by *the contact* of the Body of Christ or of the Saints.[y]

[x] Dens, Theologia, tom. v. p. 45.
[y] Ibid. p. 47.

"Is the blessed Virgin to be honoured with the respective worship of *Latria*, on account of the contact of Christ, AS THE CROSS OF CHRIST IS ADORED? . . . Thomas replies in the negative. The difference is, because the Cross is an inanimate thing, the worship of which is in itself only respective," &c.[z]

11. I shall now produce an example of the sort of instruction which is given to the people on such subjects at the present day. The following extracts are made from a Catechism of "Christian doctrine," printed at Florence in 1837.

"*M.* What is adoration? [*l'adorazione.*]

"*D.* An act of religion, with which we worship the Divine Majesty, and submit ourselves to Him in acknowledgment of His supreme dominion.

"*M.* Of what kind is it?

"*D.* Of three kinds; Latria, which is paid to God; Hyperdulia, which is paid to the Virgin; Dulia, which is paid to the Saints.

"*M.* Ought we to pay any adoration at all to the images of Christ, or of the Virgin, or of the Saints?

"*D.* If we consider them only in themselves as a sacred and blessed thing, we shew them that respect only which we feel towards a sacred and blessed thing; but considered as the *representative* of a Saint, we ought *to adore them with the same kind of adoration with which we adore the Saint which they represent.*"[a]

12. In fine, the Roman Pontifical fully confirms and authorizes the same doctrine. It expressly asserts that "LATRIA *is due to the Cross,*"[b] i. e. to an *image* of the Cross, a position which contains the doctrine of Aquinas and the schoolmen, that *the same worship is due to an image as to the original;* and from which it follows that images of the Trinity, of God, of

[z] Ibid. p. 48.

[a] "Considerate come rappresentative di un Santo, si debbono adorare con quell" adorazione, con cui si adora quel Santo che rappresentano." Dottrina Gristiana composta dal Sacerdote Francesco Baldini Paroco dei SS. Vito e Modesto All 'Incisa. Firenze, nella Stamperia Brazzini, 1837.

[b] Ille qui gladium Imperatori pæfert, et alius crucem Legati, portans simul ire debent. Crux Legati quia debetur ei Latria erit à dexteris, et gladius Imperatoris à sinistris. Ordo ad recipiendum procession. Imperat. Pontificale Romanum Clementis VIII. p. 672. Ed. Rom. 1595; Pont. Rom. Urban. VIII. Pars iii. p. 109. Paris. 1664; Pont. Rom. p. 571. Typis Vaticanis, 1745.

Christ, and of the Cross, as well as relics of the Cross, are to be worshipped with LATRIA.

It has now been proved that IDOLATROUS WORSHIP OF IMAGES AND RELICS, has been authorized and sanctioned by the leading Divines of the Roman Communion from the time of the Council of Trent to the present day. Here none of the subterfuges so commonly resorted to by Romanists can avail them. It is in vain that they exclaim "that they pay no divine honours to the images or relics of the *Saints*." We reply, that *this is not our charge*. We only charge their Divines with recommending the worship of images of Christ, of God, of the Trinity, of the Cross, of the Virgin; and relics of Christ, of the true Cross, and of the instruments of the Passion. It is in vain also that they protest "that they do not offer Divine honours to images. We understand their distinctions. They do not worship images *per se*, or as they are so much wood or stone; they worship them as *representatives* of their originals. They can therefore deny that they worship images, while at the same time they do in reality worship them most devotedly. It is in vain also that they assure us that they do not worship images "as Gods," or "for Gods," or "instead of God;" for we know that they do not believe that an image of God is itself God; and do not worship it as such. They worship it however as the *representative* of God: and in this view give to it the honours due to God Himself. Such are the subterfuges to which Romanists are driven in their attempt to elude the charge of idolatry.

But it may be alleged, that such doctrines are merely discussed in the theological schools, and never enter into popular instruction; that consequently there is no idolatry in fact practised amongst the people.

Now in the first place it will be observed, that I have quoted a Catechism intended for *popular instruction*, and printed only five years ago, in which it is plainly inculcated that the same kind of adoration is due to an image as to its original. From which it follows, that divine honours are due to certain images. I would next remark, that the doctrines above mentioned have never been restricted to the schools; for Bellarmine thinks it necessary to recommend that in sermons to the people it should not be said that Latria is due to images;[c] and on the other hand, Vasquez is of opinion that, in popular discourses, the method of the old schoolmen, who absolutely affirmed that Latria is due

[c] Bellarmin. De Reliquiis Sanct. l. ii. c. xxii.

to them, is preferable.[d] Cabrera also supposes that these doctrines are known to the people.[e] There is in fact no sort of attempt to conceal them; except indeed from the opponents of Romanism.

Supposing however that they were not expressly taught to the people, the danger of idolatry would scarcely be in the slightest degree diminished. For it is undeniable that Romanists are taught to "worship" and "adore" images: the use of those words is continual. But, according to the "Declaration of the Vicars Apostolic," "the words 'adoration' and 'worship' are *equally* referred, sometimes to God, and sometimes to creatures."[f] Veron says that "*certainly* the people understand by the word 'adoration' *the absolute worship of* LATRIA;"[g] and the Wallemburghs affirm that the people "*often* understand the word 'adoration' as signifying the *highest honour due only to God, which we call* LATRIA."[h] Hence it follows necessarily that the perpetual inculcation in the Roman Communion of the worship and adoration of images leads the people into idolatry.

The mere profession of the Christian religion is no more an infallible safeguard against idolatry than it is against heresy or any other sin. Bossuet himself admits that "there might be some reason to fear for the ignorant," that the use of images would lead them to "idolatry."[i] That man is naturally inclined to this sin is evident from the fact, that the great majority of the world has been at all times actually involved in it, and that even the *chosen people of God* under the former dispensation became, to a great extent, worshippers of false gods. Hence there can be no sort of assurance that the mere profession of true religion affords any security against idolatry.

But it is frequently alleged that the Council of Trent enacted certain decrees on the subject of images and relics which removed all danger of idolatrous worship. To this I have to answer first, that all the writers whom I have cited lived after the Council of Trent, and were so far from admitting that their doctrine was condemned in that Council, that they continually adduce the decrees of Trent in confirmation of their own views.

[d] Vasquez, De Cultu Adorationis Libri Tres, l. ii. disp. ix. c. i. p. 374.

[e] Cabrera, in iii. part S. Thomæ. tom. ii. p. 555. Ed. 1602.

[f] Declaration, &c. Sect. iv.

[g] Certè populus intelligit adorationis nomine cultum Latriæ absolutum; isto autem sine dubio non redditur nisi soli Deo. Veron, Regula Fidei, § viii.

[h] Wallenburch, Controvers. tom. ii. p. 206.

[i] Veron, *ubi supra*.

Secondly, it is evident on examination, that the Council of Trent made no decision against the doctrines of Aquinas and the schoolmen on these points. Thirdly, Veron, after mentioning the different doctrines of the schoolmen as to the worship of images and relics, says, that the Council of Trent observes a prudent silence as to these opinions, "and teaches nothing else but that '*due* honour and veneration is to be rendered to them.' Wherefore none of the aforesaid (doctrines) is *de fide*: therefore let them be kept within the bounds of the schools. You are not obliged to subscribe to any of them in order to be a Catholic. Subscribe the Council of Trent only,"[k] &c. So that, notwithstanding the decrees of the Council of Trent, members of the Roman Communion are at perfect liberty to maintain that Divine honours are due to certain images and relics.

From what has been said it follows necessarily that YOU CANNOT WARN YOUR PEOPLE against offering relative LATRIA or *Divine honours* to the images and relics which I have mentioned, AS AGAINST A SIN. For in the first place, the Council of Trent has not made any decision against the practice. Secondly, your most eminent theologians have generally maintained it, and have never been censured for so doing by any Popes, Councils, or Bishops. Thirdly, those theologians have maintained that their doctrine is supported by the Fathers, by theological reasons, by the general consent of theologians, by the practice of the Roman Church, and by several General Councils, including that of Trent; and according to the doctrine of probability generally received by Romanists, it is perfectly safe to receive any doctrine supported by such grave reasons. Fourthly, the doctrine of Aquinas and the schoolmen is regularly maintained in your schools at the present day. Hence it is plain that you cannot by any possibility teach your people that the above-mentioned idolatrous worship of images and relics is a sin. You are on the contrary obliged to admit to them that it is lawful, and that it is not idolatrous.

Hence we may turn over all your Treatises on Doctrinal and Moral Theology; all your directions to Confessors; all your Catechisms and books of devotion; and never find in any of them any *condemnation* of the practice of offering Latria to the images and relics which I have mentioned. It is true, that some of your writers *argue* against it: but none of them venture to *condemn* it; or to say that it is *sinful*; or that it is in any degree *idolatrous*. It forms no subject of confession: no penitent is ever questioned on the point: no one is ever put to penance for offering Divine honours to created objects. Idolatry

[k] Veron, *ubi supra*.

is, perhaps, the most prevalent of your sins, and it is that which is the most easily tolerated. It would seem to be the object of your writers to close every avenue by which a conviction of danger on this point could be brought home to the consciences of your people. Every doubt and scruple is set at rest by the assurances of your theologians, that Idolatry consists in worshipping images as if they were "other Gods," in *opposition* to the only true God[l]—or in worshipping the images of *false gods* like those of the Heathen—or in imagining that the Divinity is *present* in images—or in offering *sacrifice* to images.[m] They are told, that there is *no danger of idolatry* amongst Christians:—"Now that Christianity has reigned amongst us for so many centuries, what danger can be seen in images, when the faithful learn from their infancy that they are forbidden 'to ask any grace from them, or to place their confidence in them,' . . . and that if they prostrate themselves, and bend their knees before them, it is only to the *originals*, i. e. to Jesus Christ and the Saints, that this suppliant posture is referred?"[n] Thus Romanists are encouraged to commit acts of the most fearful Idolatry without the slightest compunction or trouble of conscience. They are satisfied that they *cannot* commit Idolatry; and, therefore, indulge in it without any check or control whatever.

I have now accomplished the object which was proposed in this Letter. I have shewn that Idolatry is approved and authorized in the Church of Rome; that it is practised without any censure or effectual resistance; that your people are allowed to commit this most fearful of all sins without impediment or scruple. What are we to conclude from this?

First, may it not be most reasonably inferred, that if the authorities of your Communion do not actually themselves practise Idolatry, they are surrounded by an overwhelming mass of Idolatry; that the people and their priests are to a great extent given over to that dreadful sin? Surely, nothing but the power and number of those who are inclined to Idolatry could prevent your Rulers from vindicating the rights of their Creator, if they really believed that those rights were infringed. We must therefore conclude, either that your *Rulers*, as well as your divines and people, *approve* of idolatrous worship; or else, that *through fear of man*, they connive at what they know to be most damnable sin. In either case, what are we to think of the *sanctity* of the Roman Church? What are we to think of the *safety*

[l] Trevern, Discuss. Amicale, tom. ii. p. 336, 339.
[m] Ibid. p. 341.
[n] Trevern, Discuss. Amicale, tom. ii. p. 352.

of its members? And what are we to think of those who forsake a Communion in which Idolatry is not practised, to enter one in which it is approved, sanctioned, and practised without the least check or control?

Secondly, from what has been said, we cannot doubt the necessity of THE REFORMATION. If the only result of that movement had been to *expel* from amongst us the doctrines of Aquinas and the schoolmen on the worship of images and relics, and to enable us to oppose an effectual and open resistance to those doctrines by pronouncing them sinful and idolatrous, *an incalculable benefit* would have been obtained—a benefit which was more than sufficient to counterbalance numerous evils and disadvantages.

Thirdly, we may learn to judge more fairly of the Reformers. They were brought up in the midst of a system deeply tinged with Idolatry, both in doctrine and practice. They understood by experience, and saw in all its unveiled deformity, what we can only learn imperfectly from scarce and ancient writings, or from modern compositions, in which the utmost care is taken to conceal the real state of things. Their language and their actions, therefore, sometimes appear to us exaggerated or uncharitable, when the fault lies rather in our own ignorance or credulity. Were we possessed of their *practical knowledge*, we should perhaps exceed them ourselves in the energy of our denunciations.

Fourthly, we can sympathize with the feelings and principles of Bishop Jewell and other English Reformers, who were jealous of the use of images, and of certain vestments or ceremonies connected more or less, in their own minds, with idolatrous practices. Certainly the Cross and the images of our Lord had been worshipped with idolatrous honours; and we cannot therefore wonder at the indignation which was sometimes expressed on matters which we, in our ignorance of the fearful abuses connected with them, may regard as innocent, lawful, or even pious and venerable.

Fifthly, if some errors or defects can be pointed out in the doctrine or discipline of societies which are separated from the Roman Communion, yet still they cannot be greater evils than the existence of IDOLATRY in that Communion. If some persons deny the necessity of Episcopacy; their error is not greater than that of maintaining that the Bishop of Rome is *de jure divino* the Head of the Church. If some sects undervalue Confirmation: Rome gives but half of the Eucharist. If the worship of others is meagre or uninteresting, Rome sanctions the adoration of creatures with Divine honours. If repentance is

almost reduced to a name by some, Rome deprives the penitent of all consolation, and pursues the justified and pardoned beyond the grave with the tortures of hell. If some Churches are divided on trivial points and by carnal spirits, Rome enforces unity and silence on points where the most sacred interests of the truth and the glory of God are compromised. If there are needless disputes on words in some communities, Rome permits heresy and idolatry within her own bosom. If some have schismatically separated from the Church, Rome has wrongfully expelled many from her communion. If there be a spirit of incredulity in some; Rome encourages fabulous miracles, and impostures of every kind. If some persons seem in theory to supersede the office of the ministry, by the assertion of an unlimited right of interpreting the Bible according to the dictates of their private judgment, Rome discourages the perusal of the Scriptures, and withdraws them from the Church. If the ministry in some communities is despoiled of much of its legitimate influence, Rome invests it with absolute and inquisitorial power, and teaches the people to bow before it with a superstitious and almost slavish veneration. If some persons are hostile even to the most harmless ceremonies, Rome encourages a system of display and worldly pomp in the celebration of worship. If enthusiasm and fanaticism are common in sects, Rome invests the wildest fanaticism with saintly dignity, and holds it up to the worship of the faithful. If sordid self-interest has commonly been at the foundation of sects, Rome has permitted discipline to be relaxed, and superstition and idolatry to be disseminated more and more widely, for the pecuniary advantage of its priesthood, and for the promotion of its own interests. There are, in short, very few of the prevalent evils of religion beyond the Roman Communion, which may not be contrasted with evils of as great an amount, or even still greater, within that Communion.

In conclusion, I would observe, that if any members of the Church of England are ever disturbed on finding that some others of its members have advanced unsound positions, and that such persons have not been censured as they deserve; still they should remember that we at least can openly resist and denounce false doctrines, and thus guard the faithful against their reception; while in the Church of Rome IDOLATRY exercises *unresisted* sway; and priest and people are consigned to its abominations, without a single warning voice to tell them that they are in the ways of sin and of eternal death. I do not mean to say that all members of the Church of Rome are *obliged* to commit this crime; nor do I pretend to say that all *actually do* commit

it. God alone knows the extent to which it prevails; but it is certain that there is no safeguard whatever against it in the Roman Communion except the special grace of God; and we therefore fervently hope and pray that this grace may abound, to the deliverance of many souls from so great and terrible a danger.

I remain, Sir, yours in Christ,

WILLIAM PALMER.

Oxford, March 8th, 1842.

BX
1765
.P3

Letters to N. Wiseman on the errors of Romanism / Palmer

201310

201310

BX
1765
.P3

St. Mark's Library
The General Theological Seminary
175 Ninth Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10011

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
00114550